WESTERN EUROPE

IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

AN AFTERMATH

BY THE LATE

E. A. FREEMAN, M.A., Hon. D.C.L.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

LONDON
MACMILLAN AND CO., Limited
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1904

All rights reserved

D121
.F85

67586
'05

OXFORD: HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PREFACE

When the late Mr. E. A. Freeman set forth on his last visit to Spain his immediate interest was the completion of his History of Sicily. It was known, however, by his friends that he had left behind in an unfinished state the materials for a volume on Western Europe in the Fifth Century. Like many other historical students he was much interested in the few historical notices that have survived concerning the events in Britain during the fifth century. He desired to understand them, and as far as possible to fit them in with what we know of the general political development of Western Europe, and he felt that the only way of approaching this subject with any chance of permanent success was to make sure of the events that had happened in Gaul. If we understood clearly what had occurred there we were at least in possession of information which would keep us from wrong ideas as to what might have happened in insular Britain. The incidents that are recorded are so brief and isolated that, taken by themselves, they fail to give us any idea of what was going on, but when we look at them in the light created by events in Gaul we perceive faint traces of a connexion between them; it is the fading influence of the magic name, *res-publica Romana*, and the efforts that were being made, secular and religious, to revive it for the salvation of the island. It was then for this purpose that he had given as professor two or three courses of lectures on this subject, and it is evident from such

portions of his manuscript that remain that he had set out his work with the view to its publication. Some of the chapters he had completed, some were still fragmentary, and for each section he had provided some notes or indications of notes, and in what was meant for an appendix he had discussed at greater length than was possible in the text one or two questions of especial importance. The manuscript of these lectures, just as it was found, was handed over to his friend, the late Professor York Powell, who very kindly undertook to see the volume through the press. This, however, he never accomplished, and after his premature death the portions which he had worked off, a rough print of the rest, and such sheets of the manuscript as could be found, were returned to Mr. Freeman's executors. Professor York Powell had revised for the press sheets B to P, i.e. the first 224 pages. The rest was all in the rough, and called for arrangement, correction, and the verification of the references, an amount of work which his numerous engagements had probably made it impossible for him to accomplish. It is obvious, therefore, that the present volume suffers very much for lack of the author's final notes and arrangement, but it was felt that work so good, carried out on ground which had never before been so carefully considered, should not be allowed to remain unpublished. It is now offered to the historical student, a mere earnest of what it would have been, and yet a fragment too valuable to be allowed to perish.

T. SCOTT HOLMES.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	The Invasion of Gaul	1
II.	A Tyrant of the West	35
III.	Constantine Emperor and Maximus Tyrant	81
IV.	The Barbarian Invaders	130
V.	West-Goths and Burgundians	171
VI.	Wallia and the Settlement of Aquitaine	226
VII.	Theodoric the West-Goth and Aetius	264
VIII.	Chlodowig the Frank	288
APPENDIX I.	Aetius and Boniface	305
II.	The Second Carausius	371
INDEX		375

WESTERN EUROPE IN THE FIFTH CENTURY.

I.

[THE INVASION OF GAUL.]

THE movements within and without the Empire which, in the course of a few years at the beginning of the fifth century, altogether changed the face of Western Europe have never, as far as I know, been told in our own tongue, perhaps not in any other tongue, as a connected tale. The facts are recorded by Gibbon with his usual accuracy, clearness, and careful reference to authorities; but they are scattered over several chapters and are never brought together in their relation to one another. To Gibbon, with Rome itself as his main subject, their importance lay chiefly in their purely Roman aspect, as so many blows dealt to the power of Rome. To our latest English inquirer into these times they naturally come in the same way, important only as they bear on the destinies of Italy and her invaders. Mr. Hodgkin does not give, because he was not called upon to give, a minute or a consecutive narrative any more than Gibbon does. Of the German writers on the *Völkerwanderung*, Dahn and Pallmann hardly touch

these particular years; Wietersheim has a careful and critical examination of the facts and authorities; but it hardly amounts to a narrative*. Of writers dealing specially with our own island, Lappenberg has a sketch, to the purpose as far as it goes, of the British side of the story, but he hardly attempts to connect it with the continental side. Mr. Green, in the *Making of England*, attempts no examination of authorities, and he gives a few words only to the continental side; but it is clear that he had fully grasped the connexion between the two. Tillemont in a past age, Clinton in the age just before our own, have brought the authorities together with their usual painstaking research. And I venture to think that the time has not yet come when we can afford to cast away collectors whom no scrap of information in the original writers ever seems to escape. But Clinton does not attempt a narrative, and the narrative which the worthy Tillemont does attempt, though it is well to follow the example of Gibbon and Hodgkin in keeping it ever at our elbow, can hardly be looked on as sufficient according to the standard of modern criticism. Fauriel, in his *Histoire de la Gaule Meridionale sous la domination des conquérants Germains*, has used his authorities well, and he comes nearer than any other writer to giving a connected narrative of the events with which we are immediately concerned. Still his point of view, the point of view of a countryman of Sidonius and Gregory, is distinctly South-Gaulish. It is no part

* Dahn has since in his *Urgeschichte* come much nearer to a connected story.

of his business to take any special points to connect the continental with the insular story. As for myself, I must say that, while I have taken the deepest interest in attempting to put together a fuller and more connected narrative of the whole story than I have yet seen, and in the work which is the necessary condition of so doing, the minute examination of the evidence of the original writers, I have a motive beyond. In much that I shall have to say from this Chair, I shall strive to guide you into Britain by way of Gaul, into England by way, if not of France, yet of the elements out of which France slowly grew. If I keep you long with the Goth and the Frank in their Gaulish realms, it will not be only because of the surpassing interest and instruction of their story in their Gaulish realms, but also because a full understanding of their position in their Gaulish realms is the best means to enable us by force of contrast to grasp the true position of the Angle and the Saxon in their British realms. I am leading you to Northumbrian Bæda by the guidance of Arvernian Gregory. If I am set in this Chair to strive to show that European history is one unbroken tale, I am set in it also to strive to show that Englishmen are Englishmen. I believe that the latest theories of all go once more to set aside that doctrine as an old wives' fable. Now I venture to think that the spritely youths who, I am told, blow their trumpet somewhat loudly to say that what they are pleased to call 'the Teutonic theory' is exploded, have not given much of their time to any very deep study of Gregory of Tours. The plain truth, so despised of many, that

we are ourselves and not somebody else, is more easily grasped if we look first at the fortunes of those branches of our race which did not remain ourselves but did become somebody else, and see how utterly unlike those fortunes are to ours. I trust, before many terms are over, to set before you a distinctly English story. As yet, I am dealing with our kinsfolk in foreign lands. The new theories will tell you that we were no more in our conquered island than they were in the conquered mainland. It is well then, before we examine what was the place that the Jute, the Angle, and the Saxon held in Britain, to understand thoroughly what was the place which the Burgundian, the Goth, and the Frank held in Gaul.

Of that inquiry the present course will bring us only to the threshold; but it is a stage which cannot be left out. The main importance of these years lies in this, that in them the ground was made ready for the plantation of abiding Teutonic settlements in the three great lands of the West, in Gaul, Spain, and Britain. In Gaul, and still more in Spain, not only is the ground made ready, but the settlements actually begin; in Britain the ground is made ready, but hardly more. In our meagre notices of Britain in these years Teutonic invaders are never distinctly mentioned. They have shown themselves at an earlier time as unsuccessful invaders; they were soon to show themselves again as abiding settlers; but during the special years with which we are about to deal the Teuton shows himself in Britain at most as a passing plunderer of the coast; his future dwelling-

place is making ready for him; but he does not as yet take any steps to secure possession. Yet even at this time our own people play no inconsiderable part in the story. It is not to be forgotten that there was a Saxony in Gaul before there was a Saxony in Britain; Bayeux was a Saxon city before Winchester. Among all the invaders of Gaul the Saxon pirates of the coast are spoken of as the most dreaded, and the rovers of the Channel were not likely to keep themselves to its southern shore only, though it is only on its southern shore that they have found chroniclers of their doings. But beyond this, both at this time and in the generation when the Angle and the Saxon did begin to occupy the great island, it is of the highest moment to mark the connexion between the affairs of Britain and the affairs of the mainland. The Teutonic conquest of Britain, owing to the special circumstances both of the invaders and of the land invaded, took a wholly different shape from the Teutonic conquest of most parts of the mainland. But it was none the less part of the general *Völkerwanderung*, and it was largely affected by the same causes as the Teutonic movements on the mainland. And one side of the difference between the English conquest of Britain and the Frankish conquest of Gaul, namely the difference in the state of the invaded lands and their inhabitants, was largely owing to the events of these particular half-dozen years.

At a first glance the events of these years may seem to offer us little more than a series of uninteresting and almost unintelligible struggles for the crown of the declining Empire of Rome, or at any

rate for the imperial dominion in the provinces beyond the Alps. Emperors or tyrants rise and fall, and, by a strange fate, men whose revolt at least shows them to have been men of some energy, are overthrown to the profit of an Emperor who at no time of his reign showed any energy whatever. Honorius cannot keep Rome from the barbarians; but he can, by the hands at least of his generals, destroy every rival claimant of his diadem and can win back a large part of the provinces which they had usurped. We may safely say that Constantine, Gerontius, Jovinus, Heraclian, were any of them better fitted to reign than the son of Theodosius. But these men have a higher interest than comes from anything that connects them with Honorius. Their rise and fall are directly connected with some of the leading events in the history of the world; their tale cannot be told without telling the tale of the separation of Gaul, Britain, and Spain from the Roman dominion; the setting up and putting down of the rival tyrants cannot be recorded apart from the revolutions which at least opened the way for the growth of the leading nations of Western Europe.

As usual, the history of these years has to be made out by piecing together a great number of authorities, none of which are of first-rate merit. We have an unusual wealth of accounts, such as they are, written by men who lived at the time; but there is none who claims a high place as a narrator, still less is there any who could understand the full significance of his own days. Nor is there any who gave himself specially to remark and to record that particular chain of

events with which we are specially concerned. All is fragmentary; one fact has to be found here and another there. The age, as one of the great turning-points of the world's history, needed a Polybios to grasp its full meaning; we have not even an Ammianus to set down events in order and to make shrewd observations on them as he goes along. We can hardly doubt that the History of Olympiodôros, the Greek of Egypt, some scraps of whose many books are preserved to us by Phôtios, would, if he had come down to us whole, have given us something more like a narrative, and that a narrative of some merit, than his followers. He has at any rate given us fragments of considerable importance, whose value has been fully set forth by Mr. Hodgkin. We seek in vain for some further knowledge and some further remains of the two writers quoted by Gregory of Tours, Sulpicius Alexander and Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus. The collection of names borne by the last writer, with its Christian, its Roman, and its Teutonic elements, raises a certain curiosity about himself. Sulpicius may have concerned himself chiefly with the Franks, a people with whom we have at this moment less to do than with some others. From Orosius we have the complete work of a contemporary; from Zôsimos we have the nearly complete work of most probably a younger contemporary. Both the zealous Christian and the zealous pagan wrote with an object somewhat different from that of simply recording events as they happened, and the prejudices of both must be allowed for in measuring the value of their witness. Zôsimos too, though

a contemporary, one who was alive at the time and who wrote not very long after, can hardly be called an original writer. He seems to have written from the accounts of writers, some of whom could not have been much earlier than himself, but whom we may guess that he did not always understand. Though his account of these years seems complete, yet it is almost as fragmentary as those of Olympiodôros. It consists of pieces put together with very little regard to connexion or to chronological order, one most likely taken from one source and another from another. Yet some of the scraps of narrative thus embedded, whencesoever they may come, are of the highest moment. They preserve several of the most essential parts of our present story for which we should look in vain elsewhere. We have another narrative, full in some points, in the Ecclesiastical History of Sôzomenos, also a writer contemporary, or nearly so. The writers of our own island in after times, British Gildas and Nennius, English Bæda, who in some measure follows Gildas, and the English Chronicler who in some measure follows Bæda, can of course tell us nothing of our times beyond such traditions, written or oral, as may have lingered on till their days. But it is always well to know how the events of a past age looked in the eyes of the descendants or successors of the men who were touched by them at the time.

We are now in the age of the Annalists. And two of them, as being both contemporary and local, would, if they had written at greater length, have been the very best of all our authorities. Even as it is, the Aquitanian Prosper and the Spanish Idatius count

for as much as any of the more lengthy writers, and Idatius himself enlarges with some force when he comes to the sorrows of his own land. A British or an Armorican annalist, an annalist from the banks of the Rhine, would have been priceless indeed; but for such we have to yearn in vain. Our nearest approach to such a help is found in that annalist on whom one side of the description of the Aquitanian annalist has so oddly been bestowed, and who commonly figures as Prosper Tiro. Whoever he was, and at whatever value we rate him in other matters, we are thankful for his few and short notices of that island world which the world of Rome seems largely to have forgotten. Above all, we are thankful to him for the one notice from outside, a notice seemingly contemporary, which has come down to us of the English Conquest of Britain.

We get some help also from some writers in prose and verse whose object was not that of directly and simply recording events. We press into our service alike the pagan laureate and the Christian preacher. The stately hexameters of Claudian, the less famous elegiacs of the poet of Divine Providence, the long harangue of Salvian, the occasional notices of Jerome, all form part of our materials. Actions of Stilicho were, if not the true causes, at least the immediate occasions, of the events with which we are concerned; and where Stilicho acts, we presently hear the trumpet voice of the poet from whom we should never have learned that the devout Honorius was not a worshipper of Jupiter. Our most living picture of the invasion of Gaul itself comes from a poet of

another kind, whom some have thought to be the annalist Prosper in yet another shape. Prosper or no Prosper, he is a contemporary witness, whose verses may be more safely accepted as true to fact than the sounding lines of Claudian. He is a man of Gaul who painted the sufferings of Gaul in which he himself had shared. His verse is written to point a moral, the moral of Divine Providence; so is the prose of Salvian in his treatise of kindred title, where he gives his picture of the evils and sorrows of the time while discoursing of the government of God. We would fain believe that the Teuton was as virtuous and the Roman less vicious than the Roman preacher paints them; but we must doubtless apply the same rule to both, and take off something from the brightness of the one portrait and from the blackness of the other. Saint Jerome we have to thank for a few fiery touches of the time, for a few geographical details, for a slightly puzzling list of nations, all which certainly add to our knowledge. Altogether our materials are far from scanty; many important periods are far worse off. We cannot venture to ask for a Polybios at every great turn of the world's history. We are inclined to lament that we have no such light as Ammianus throws on the century that goes before and Procopios on the century that follows.

It is by a sound instinct as to the general march of events, though with some disregard to exact chronology, that Bæda and the English Chronicler connect the separation of Britain from the Roman dominion with the Gothic taking of Rome. Rome was broken

by the Goths, and since then no Roman kings reigned over Britain *. It was not the actual taking of Rome, but it was that Gothic invasion of Italy of which the taking of Rome was the most striking

* Bæda (i. 11) brings in his first date with some chronological solemnity. He had Orosius before him, but he leaves out and amplifies to suit his own purpose. His date stands thus;

"Anno ab incarnatione Domini quadrigentesimo septimo, tenente imperium Honorio Augusto filio Theodosii minore, loco ab Augusto quadragesimo quarto, ante biennium Romanæ irruptionis quæ per Alaricum regem Gothorum facta est, cum gentes Alanorum, Suevorum, Vandalorum, multæque cum his aliæ, protritis Francis, transito Hreno, totas per Gallias sævirent."

At the point of time thus marked, first Gratian and then Constantine are set up; the history of Constantine follows, and then

"Fracta est autem Roma a Gothis millesimo centesimo sexagesimo quarto suæ conditionis, ex quo tempore Romani in Britannia regnare cesserunt, post annos ferme quadringentos septuaginta ex quo Gaius Julius Cæsar eamdam insulam adiit."

The English Chroniclers leave out all the former extract, and translate the second under the year 409 (in the late Canterbury version, 408). The fullest form is in the Peterborough version;

"Her wæs tobrocen Romana burh fram Gotum, ymb XI hund wintra and X wintra þæs þe eo getimbred wæs. Siððan ofer þæt ne rixodan leng Romana cinigas on Brytene. Ealles hi ðær rixodan IIII hund wintre and hund seofenti wintra siððan Gaius Iulius þæt land erost gesohte."

The other versions have several small differences, and the word *leng* is in Peterborough only. And it may be noticed that, while Bæda does not imply that the Romans had ruled in the island ever since the landing of Gaius Julius, the Chroniclers do.

Bæda leaves out the actual separation of Britain, as recorded by Zôsimos. Coming between the expedition and the taking of Rome, it got mixed up with both those events, and was lost between them. He also placed, like so many others, the taking of Rome in 409 instead of 410.

incident, which led to that general breaking-up of the Roman power in the West, of which the departure of the legions from Britain was that side which most directly concerned ourselves and our predecessors on British soil. As a matter of fact, Britain had really fallen away from the dominion of Rome before Rome was taken by Alaric. In truth, the actual taking of Rome, looked at as something having a practical effect on the course of events at the time, was of less importance than that it now seems to have or than it seemed to have in the eighth and ninth centuries. In more senses than one,

Suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit.

Rome had so thoroughly spread herself over the whole of her own world, the whole of that world had so thoroughly become Rome, that the direct importance of the local Rome had come to be less than that of many other cities. Rome was neither a seat of government nor the guardian of an exposed frontier. Her actual capture and sack was a solemn and terror-striking incident, which gave endless opportunities for pointing a moral; it was the sign that an old day was passing away and that a new day was coming; it was a thing to be remembered in later days as no other event of those times was likely to be remembered; but at the moment it made little practical difference to any but those who immediately suffered by it. What really changed the face of Western Europe was not that Rome was taken but that Rome was threatened. It was the presence of Alaric in Italy, a presence of which the taking of Rome was as it were the formal witness, which opened the way for

the separation of the Western lands from the Empire and for the beginning of the powers of the modern world.

Yet, at the moment when our immediate story begins, Alaric was not in Italy; he had entered the land and he had left it; he had left it, as Roman poets and official writers loudly proclaimed, a defeated man, chief of a people that Rome had crushed for ever*. He had entered Italy, it would seem, with Radagaisus, as his ally. Such seems the express witness of such authorities as we have†. It may be that Alaric and Radagaisus entered Italy by distinct paths, and that the warfare of the Roman armies in Rhætia, which is described as happening at the same time as the coming of Alaric, may have been warfare directed against another Gothic leader who came in alliance with him‡. The fight of Pollentia has been

* The whole poem of Claudian on the sixth Consulship of Honorius is an expansion of this theme; but it comes out most tersely in the inscription, if it be genuine, "Getarum nationem in omne ævum domitam." Hodgkin, i. 722–7.

† Prosper distinctly couples Radagaisus with Alaric; "Stilichone et Aureliano coss. Gothi Italiam, Alarico et Radagaiso *ducibus*, ingressi." So Cassiodorus, changing the style to "Halarico et Radagaiso *regibus*."

‡ So Hodgkin, i. 711–33. The words of Claudian, De Bello Getico, 279, are;

"Irrupere Getæ, nostras dum Rætia vires
Occupat, atque alio desudant Marte cohortes."

This would certainly be more naturally taken of some movement in Rhætia itself, quite distinct from the Gothic invasion. I believe there is no other reference to Radagaisus as a partner of Alaric in this invasion. As for Rhætia, we must not forget another obscure reference in Claudian, De Bello Getico, 414;

variously described as a Roman victory, a Gothic victory, and a drawn battle*; it is certain that its practical effect was favourable to Rome. Alaric left Italy, and again, as in the last days of the fourth century, the Imperial power was undisputed throughout all the lands of the West.

But that power was no longer what it had been even at the beginning of the last year of that century. When Stilicho entered on his second final consulship, whatever dangers seemed to threaten the dominions of the Western Emperor still came from the lands which were under the rule of his Eastern brother. The Eastern power of Rome, destined to live on unbroken for more than eight centuries, had been shaken by the coming of the Goth, and had needed the help of the West to rid itself for a while of his presence and his ravages. The Western division of the Empire, destined so soon to break in pieces, still seemed to be safely guarded by the arm of its consul. A few years before Stilicho had, we are told, restored the power of Rome on the Rhenish frontier almost by

"Accurrit vicina manus quam Rætia nuper
Vindelicis auctam spoliis defensa probavit."

Whatever this refers to, it can hardly be taken of a Gothic invasion under Radagaisus. The question, however, though of some importance for the history of Italy, matters little for that of Gaul and Britain.

* The question is discussed by Mr. Hodgkin, i. 722. It concerns us very little, as whatever was the military result of Alaric's invasion of Italy, it led to the withdrawal of the legions from the Rhine. I have followed, with Mr. Hodgkin (i. 734–6), the chronology of Pallmann (402 A.D.), which seems based on the sure witness of Prosper.

a look. Drusus and Trajan had been outdone. The Suevian and the Alaman obeyed the laws of Rome. The Frankish kings, with their long yellow hair as the badge of freedom and kingship, were set up and put down at Stilicho's bidding, and *Francia*—we long for a definition of its boundaries—would no more dream of casting forth the kings that Stilicho gave than *Provincia*—we are almost tempted to use the later form of the name—would dream of casting out the immediate lieutenants of the Emperor. The Salian had betaken himself to the tilth of the ground; the Sicambrian had beaten his sword into a pruning-hook; the traveller crossed the border-stream or sailed along its waters, and asked which shore of Rhine was that which Rome specially claimed as her own. Britain, delivered and guarded—walled in, we are tempted to render it—at the word of the conqueror, had seen the Scot driven back to his own island; she no longer feared the Pict, nor looked with dread lest every wind should bring the keels of the Saxon to her shores *. We wish that we had some further

* Claudian's poem on the First Consulship of Stilicho seems to be our only authority for these exploits. He specially enlarges on the speed of his patron's victories (i. 188–97);

"Miramur rabidis hostem succumbere bellis
Cum solo terrore ruant? Num classica Francis
Intulimus? Jacuere tamen. Num Marte Suevos
Contudimus, quis jura damus? Quis credere possit?
Ante tubam nobis audax Germania servit.
Cedant, Druse, tui, cedant, Trajane, labores.
Vestra manus dubio quidquid discrimine gessit,
Transcurrens egit Stilichon; *totidemque diebus*
Edomuit Rhenum, quot vos potuistis in annis;
Quem ferro alloquiis, quem vos cum milite, solus."

authority for this glowing picture than the laureate strains in which Claudian welcomed his patron's consulship; but all cannot be imagination. Ten years

Again (i. 218);

"Tempore tam parvo tot prælia sanguine nullo
Perficis; et Luna nuper nascente profectus
Ante redis quam plena fuit."

The Franks especially are subdued and subdued for ever (i. 203);

"Ingentia quondam
Nomina, *crinigero flaventes vertice reges*,
Qui nec principibus, donis precibusque vocati,
Paruerant, jussi properant, segnique verentur
Offendisse mora."

(i. 236.) "Provincia missos
Expellet citius, fallax quam Francia reges
Quos dederis. Acie nec jam pulsare rebelles
Sed vinclis punire licet."

(i. 220.) "Rhenumque minacem
Cornibus infractis adeo mitescere cogis
Ut Salius jam rura colat, flexosque Sygambrus
In falcem curvet gladios, geminasque viator
Cum videat ripas, *quæ sit Romana requiret*."

One longs for some other account, even the driest entry in the Annals. Taken literally, the poet's words imply that Stilicho brought the Franks and other nations to submit, without striking a blow and even without the presence of an army. The account of Stilicho's doings in Britain is even vaguer (ii. 247);

"Inde Caledonio velata Britannia monstro,
Ferro picta genis, cujus vestigia verrit
Cærulus, Oceanique æstum mentitur, amictus;
Me quoque vicinis pereuntem gentibus, inquit,
Munivit Stilichon, totam cum Scotus Iernen
Movit et infesto spumavit remige Tethys.
Illius effectum curis ne tela timerem
Scotica, ne Pictum tremerem, ne littore toto
Prospicerem dubiis venturum Saxona ventis."

or more of quiet in Britain and on the German frontier seem to show that the successes of Stilicho in the first years of the two brothers, however they may have been tricked out by the poet's fancy, were real successes which did their work for a season. His Frankish successes especially seem to have been of real importance and to have had an effect on the events with which we are more immediately concerned. The Franks on the left bank of the Rhine, those who were settled within the borders of the Empire as its subjects, though sometimes turbulent subjects, the Salians presently to be so famous, appear in our story as discharging the duty of Roman allies. But that such successes as those of Stilicho were needed to keep the professed subjects of the Empire in their allegiance is the surest sign of the growing weakness of the Roman power in the Western lands. It might be at any moment restored to its full geographical extent and to the outward form of its ancient authority. But the fabric of dominion needed constant propping, not to say rebuilding, and a time came when rebuilding was no longer possible. Before the fourth century was ended, before the year was ended to which Stilicho gave his name, Alaric was in Italy, and to withstand the presence of Alaric in Italy, the mainstay of the Roman power in the Western lands out of Italy was taken sway. Whether Alaric won or lost the field of Pollentia, his coming indirectly tore away Britain from the Roman dominion, and began the work of dismemberment in Gaul and Spain.

For the Gothic invasion of Italy needed to be with-

stood with all the forces that the declining power of Rome could muster. If Pollentia was a Roman victory, it was a victory that was won only by leaving the distant frontiers of Rome exposed to every invader. To meet Alaric came not only the troops which had lately defended Rhætia *, but the troops that guarded the most distant outposts of Rome. The Rhine was left without its defenders; the men who had kept watch against Chatti and Cherusci and the yellow Sicambri †—in these last at least we see the Ripuarian Franks—came to the defence of Italy; so did even the legion which had guarded Roman Britain against the Pict and the Scot ‡. We are bidden to believe that, even when the legions were gone, the dread of the name of Stilicho was so great that it was enough to guard all these frontiers without material help. The overthrow of Alaric struck such fear into all hearts that no subject dared to revolt, no enemy to invade; even proud Germany remained at peace, and did not risk the passage of the border-stream, although no

* See above, p. 13, note ‡.

† De Bello Getico, 420;

"Quæque domant Chattos immansuetosque Cheruscos,
Huc omnes vertere minas, tutumque remotis
Excubiis Rhenum solo terrore relinquunt."

‡ Ib. 416;

"Venit et extremis legio prætenta Britannis,
Quæ Scoto dat fræna truci, ferroque notatas
Perlegit exsangues Picto moriente figuras."

As to the particular legion referred to, sixth or twentieth, see Hodgkin, i. 716.

soldier guarded its Roman bank *. And yet this daring flight of panegyric seems to have some ground of fact to start from. When Claudian wrote, things may well have been quiet on the German border; for they seem to have remained so for more than two years longer. We have no record of any movements on the Rhine till the date, so minutely given, when, on the last day of the year 406 †, the great Teutonic invasion of Gaul began. It was an invasion, not an occupation. Those who now crossed the Rhine found no settled dwelling-place till they had crossed the Pyrenees as well. It was Spain, not Gaul, which the actual invaders of the moment tore away from the Empire. To Gaul the actual invasion was a frightful blow; but, had nothing more come of it, it would have been only a passing blow. It was the working of this great movement on lands

* De Bello Getico, 423;

"Ullane posteritas credet? Germania quondam
Illa ferox populis, quæ vix instantibus olim
Principibus tota poterat cum mole teneri,
Tam sese placidæ præstat Stilichonis habenis,
Ut nec præsidiis nudato limine tentet
Expositum calcare solum, nec transeat amnem,
Incustoditam metuens attingere ripam."

He goes on with a comparison between Stilicho and Camillus his only equal;

"Vestris namque armis Alarici fracta quievit
Et Brenni rabies."

† Prosper Aq.; "Arcadio VI et Probo Coss. Vandali et Alani, trajecto Rheno, Gallias pridie kal. Januarias ingressi." Clinton would read "*Jun.*" for "*Jan.*," placing it in the summer instead of in the winter.

beyond the bounds of Gaul which caused it to have any lasting effect on the state of Gaul itself.

Our best authority speaks only of Vandals and Alans as having taken part in the invasion. Yet there can be no doubt that those other writers are quite correct who add the name of the Suevians to the list *. These three nations, Vandals, Alans, and Suevians, are those which we find a few years later establishing kingdoms in Spain. And of those we must remark that two only are strictly Teutonic nations. The Alans, though their history is so much mixed up with that of various branches of the Teutonic race, and though we may believe that they had become in some measure Teutonized, were in themselves barbarians in the strictest sense of the word, aliens to Teutonic as well as to Roman fellowship. Their invasion would of itself, under other circumstances, have belonged to the same class as the later invasions of the Hun, the Avar, and the Magyar.

* The chief of these is Orosius (vii. 39), whose account we shall have to examine presently. His list is "Gentes Halanorum et, ut dixi, Suevorum, *multæque cum his aliæ.*" So Zôsimos (vi. 3), who tells the story rather out of place, to explain the causes of the movement in Britain which followed the invasion of Gaul, but which he tells before it. His words are *ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσι χρόνοις, ἕκτον ἤδη τὴν ὕπατον ἔχοντος Ἀρκαδίου καὶ Πρόβου, Βανδίλοι Συηβοῖς καὶ Ἀλανοῖς ἑαυτοὺς ἀναμίξαντες τούτους ὑπερβάντες τοὺς τόπους τοῖς ὑπὲρ Ἄλπεσιν ἔθνεσιν ἐλυμήναντο.* The Vandals are here made the kernel of the invasion, as they are also by Salvianus (Gub. D. vii. 12), who, in describing the Vandals, tells us how "excitata est in perniciem et dedecus nostrum gens ignavissima (cf. Livy, iii. 67; v. 28), quæ de loco ad locum pergens, de urbe in urbem transiens, universa vastaret."

As it is, their migration is part of the Teutonic migration, a strange side of it, but one which we cannot separate from the other sides. It is an application on a great scale of the universal law that a great national migration always carries with it some who do not belong to the main stock of the invaders, but who are from some cause led to throw in their lot with them. In this way it may be perfectly true, as we may be led to gather from the words of an ecclesiastical writer, that a crowd of other nations, Teutonic, Slavonic, Heruli, Gepidæ, Sarmatians, Quadi, and many others *, had a share of some kind in the work. Detached bands of any of these nations or any others may have followed the lead of any of the chiefs of the movement. But, if so, they were lost in the general mass; it was the three nations already spoken of, Vandals, Alans, and Suevians, that gave the movement its character; it is these three that are distinctly visible in the story and in its results; it is these three that made Gaul a highway to Spain, and that found in Spain an abiding place for a longer or shorter season.

* Jerome in his letter (xcii. vol. iv. p. 748) to Ageruchia, gives his list; "Innumerabiles et ferocissimæ nationes universas Gallias occupârunt. Quidquid inter Alpes et Pyrenæum est, quod Oceano et Rheno includitur, Quadus, Wandalus, Sarmata, Halani, Gepides, Heruli, Burgundiones, Alemani, et, O lugenda respublica, Pannonii hostes vastârunt." The list reads very like a fancy one; but there must be some special force in this mention of Pannonian enemies. Who are meant? The Huns?

Fauriel (i. 39) seems to put the Gepidæ of Jerome's list in the place which is held by the Suevians in most versions. In i. 42 he seems puzzled at hearing so little about them.

As to the immediate occasion of the movement we are in the dark. It is hardly possible to reconcile the language of our authorities with the view that the Teutonic invaders of Gaul in this year were the remnants of the host with which the mysterious and terrible Radagaisus, whether he had any share in the earlier invasion of Italy or not, certainly led into Italy the year before *. But whoever were the followers of Radagaisus, it seems plain that they were utterly cut off in Italy by the generalship of Stilicho †. And all our accounts speak of the in-

* This was the view of Gibbon and of the earlier writers to whom he refers. It does not seem to be adopted by any modern scholar (see Hodgkin, i. [733, 739, 824]), and it certainly is not suggested by the language of Prosper and the other writers. Gibbon rests on the phrase of Orosius, that the invading nations were stirred up by Stilicho. See note below on Orosius' charge.

† Orosius heads his chapter (vii. 37) with the heading, "Radagaisus hostis Italiam intravit et *cæsus est cum gente sua.*" And all his expressions are to the same effect; "Radagaisus solus . . . suos deseruit." The rest were worn out with hunger or taken prisoners. So Zôsimos, vi. 26; *ἅπαν τὸ πολέμιον πανωλεθρίᾳ διέφθειρεν* [*ὁ Στιλίχων*] *ὥστε μηδένα σχεδὸν ἐκ τούτων περισωθῆναι, πλὴν ἐλαχίστους ὅσους αὐτὸς τῇ Ῥωμαίων προσέθηκε συμμαχίᾳ.* One may be sure that there is exaggeration in all this; but such phrases seem quite inconsistent with the notion that the Suevians, Vandals, and Alans who crossed the Rhine under their own kings were the remnant of this defeated host.

The "luminous passage of Prosper's Chronicle," "In tres partes, per divisos principes, divisus [Radagaisi] exercitus," is not from the true Prosper, but from the chronicle so oddly called that of Prosper Tiro (see Hodgkin, i. 702–9 [founding himself on Holder-Egger, Neu. Arch. 1876]), and it goes on: "aliquam repugnandi Romanis aperuit facultatem. Insigni triumpho exercitum tertiæ partis hostium, circumactis Hunnorum auxiliaribus Stilico

vaders of Gaul in this year as nations, nations crossing the Rhine by a fresh movement, not at all as the remnants of a defeated army. That the invasion was planned in concert with Radagaisus—if so, most likely in concert with Alaric—is perfectly possible *; but it seems easier to suppose that the nations beyond the Rhine simply took advantage of the withdrawal of the legions which followed on Alaric's invasion of Italy. In any case the coming of these armed nations was not unexpected. Honorius, or those who were so busy at the work of legislation in his name, put forth more than one decree in which an attempt was made to provide for the defence of the provinces. But we hear nothing of any movements of the legions to the threatened frontier. We find instead, a touching appeal to the lovers of their country, the lovers of peace, to stand forth each man as his zeal and courage called him, and to do each man his duty in this hour of utmost need. The slaves, too, were called on to help; in such a strait as the land was in it mattered more what a man could do than what was his state of life; the slaves of the foreigners in the Roman service, and of those who

usque ad internecionem delevit." It is hard to say what amount of value we should yield to this statement. Its exactness certainly looks as if it rested on some authority; yet it is hard to infer with Gibbon (Cap. xxx, note 4) that the "luminous passage" connects the history of Italy, Gaul, and Germany. The chronicler puts the invasion of Gaul two years later as a wholly distinct event.

* So Fauriel, i. 40. But the passage in Procopius, Bell. Vand. i. 3 (on which see note below), does not seem to bear on the matter. In the other passage which he refers to Jordanes, 31, the Vandals and Alans go into Gaul " ob metum Gottorum."

were actually under arms, were specially bidden to go and fight by the side of their masters. The freeman was promised pay and part of that pay in advance; the slave was promised a lesser pay, but accompanied by the precious gift of freedom *. Such an appeal from an Emperor who certainly had no thought of joining the muster sets us a-thinking;

* Clinton pointed out that some of the laws of Honorius, which had been thought to refer to the invasion of Italy by Radagaisus, really refer to the invasion of Gaul. They are dated in the consulship of Arcadius and Probus, that is 406. That which calls on the slaves is, what we should hardly have looked for, a little earlier than that which calls upon the freemen. Its date is Ravenna, xv. Kal. Mai., and it runs thus; "Contra hostiles impetus non solas jubemus personas considerari, sed vires, et licet ingenuos amore patriæ credamus incitari, servos etiam hujus auctoritate edicti exhortamus ut cum primum se bellicis sudoribus offerant, præmium libertatis, si apti ad militiam arma susceperint, pulveratici etiam nomine binos solidos acceptari: præcipue sane eorum servos quos militia armata detentat, fœderatorum nihilominus et dediticiorum, quoniam ipsos quoque una cum dominis constat bella tractare" (viii. Cod. Theod. Tit. xiii. De Tironibus, p. 387). Gothofred has a note on *pulveraticum*, which here at least means the pay—earned by services amid the dust of warfare—which was to be the reward of the slave who turned a soldier. The other law (p. 388) is dated from Ravenna two days later; "Provinciales pro imminentibus necessitatibus omnes invitamus edicto quos exigit ad militiam innata libertas. Ingenui igitur qui militiæ obtentu arma capiunt amore pacis et patriæ, sciant se denos solidos paratis rebus de nostro percepturos ærario, quibus tamen ternos ex summa supradicta jam nunc solidos præbere mandabimus; nam optimos futuros confidimus, quos virtus et utilitas publica necessitatibus obtulit."

We are not told whether the owners of the liberated slaves were to be paid their value, which would seem to be only recoverable in the case of masters who were themselves under arms.

among things we notice that the meaning of the word country—*patria*—has widened a good deal since a prince who moved from Rome to Capri was held to have forsaken his country*. The Roman name, now shared by all free inhabitants of the Empire, was held to have created a country and a nationality which, artificial as they might be, were deemed, at least officially, to be capable of calling up the feeling of patriotism in men's hearts.

The barbarians then were making ready for the great migration, and the Romans were at least called upon to make ready to withstand them. But are we to believe that he who before all men united both characters, the greatest of living warriors, barbarian by descent, but beyond all men Roman by calling, had stirred up the nations which now poured into the Empire which he had twice saved? At least one contemporary writer tells us, and at least one later writer copies his tale, that the invaders of Gaul were led thither by the invitation of Stilicho†. He hoped,

* Tacitus.

† Orosius (vii. 38) after some other hard words against Stilicho, charging him among other things with sparing the Goths, goes on; 'Præterea gentes alias copiis viribusque intolerabiles, quibus nunc Galliarum Hispaniarumque provinciæ premuntur; hoc est Halanorum, Suevorum, Wandalorumque, ipsoque simul motu impulsos Burgundionum ultro in arma sollicitans deterso semel Romani nominis metu suscitavit." And in a following chapter (vii. 40) we read; "Ante biennium Romanæ irruptionis [the taking of Rome by Alaric] excitatæ per Stiliconem gentes, Halanorum, ut dixi, Suevorum, Wandalorum, multæque cum his aliæ, *Francos proterunt*, Rhenum transeunt, Gallias invadunt, directoque impetu Pyrenæum usque perveniunt, cujus obice ad tempus repulsæ per

we are told, that by raising a storm which he trusted to quell, but which none other could, he might be able to transfer the Empire from his son-in-law to his son*. The tale is the statement of an enemy, but,

circumjacentes provincias refunduntur." Gibbon (c. xxx. note 46) on the phrase "excitatæ a Stilichone gentes," says, "They must mean indirectly. He saved Italy at the expense of Gaul." By a somewhat forced construction this meaning might be put on the second passage of Orosius; but the first distinctly asserts direct dealings with the invaders on the part of Stilicho.

Of the Burgundians mentioned by Orosius we shall have to speak again.

To the same effect is the chronicle called Prosper Tiro; "xvii [Arcedii et Honorii]; Diversarum gentium rabies Gallias dilacerare exorsa, immissa quam maxime Stiliconis indigne ferentis filio suo regnum negatum." It is not till three years later that he mentions the three nations spoken of by Orosius.

The bitterest enemy of Stilicho is the poet Rutilius Namatianus; but his verses (ii. 41 et seqq.) speak rather of Stilicho as letting the Goths into Italy than as doing anything with regard to Gaul. He tells us how Stilicho

> "Immisit Latiæ barbara tela neci:
> Visceribus nudis armatum condidit hostem,
> Illato cladis liberiore dolo.
> Ipse satellitibus pellitis Roma patebat
> Et captiva prius quam caperetur erat:
> Nec tantum Geticis grassatur proditer armis;
> Ante Sibyllinae fata cremavit opis."

Sôzomen (viii. 25; ix. 4) refers to the charges of treason against Stilicho, but does not speak of this particular charge, unless it lurks in the description of him as *πάντας ὡς εἰπεῖν βαρβάρους τε καὶ Ῥωμαίους πειθομένους ἔχων*. Nor has Philostorgius (xi. 3; xii. 1), though seemingly hostile to Stilicho, anything about Gaul.

See also Dahn, *Könige der Germanen*, v. 42; Wietersheim, ii. 138.

* The words of Orosius (vii. 38) are; "Sperans miser sub hac necessitatis circumstantia, quia et extorquere imperium genero

even as the statement of an enemy, it is strange. Yet we can hardly doubt as to disbelieving it. It is not a statement of visible facts: it is a surmise or a mere invention, such as we are used to in all ages. In the eyes of Stilicho's enemies, any mischief that happened was necessarily Stilicho's work.

In any case Stilicho and his legions did not this time fly to the defence of the Gaulish border; nor do we hear to what extent either the patriotic youth of Gaul or the able-bodied slaves of the barbarian mercenaries took up arms at their distant Emperor's bidding, to defend the peace of their country. Such fighting as was done seems to have been the work of defenders of the Empire of another kind. For Vandals, Alans, and Suevians at least did not enter the Gaulish provinces without finding an enemy to withstand them. Something was done in the way of diplomacy or bribery. One Alan leader, Goar by name, was persuaded to forsake the hostile enter-

posset in filium, et gentes barbaræ tam facile comprimi quam commoveri valerent. Itaque ubi imperatori Honorio exercituique Romano hæc tantorum scelerum scena patefacta est, commoto justissimo exercitu occisus est Stilico, qui, ut unum puerum purpura indueret, totius generis humani sanguinem dedit." Orosius has a suspicious knowledge of the inner workings of Stilicho's mind, for which he is not so good a witness as he is for the crossing of the Rhine.

The oddest thing of all is the confusion of Gregory of Tours (ii. 9), who misreads the second reference of Orosius into a campaign of Stilicho at the head of the barbarians; "Horosius autem et ipse historiographus in septimo operis sui libro ita commemorat, Stilicho, congregatis gentibus, Francos proterit, Rhenum transit, Gallias pervagatur, et ad Pyrenæum usque perlabitur."

prise, and to enter the service or alliance of Rome. And if the Romans of Gaul failed in their duty, the allies of Rome on the Gaulish border at the present stage of affairs did theirs manfully. The Franks, that is clearly the Ripuarian Franks on the right bank of the Rhine, met the Vandals in battle. The Vandal king Godegisl and twenty thousand of his warriors were slain; the whole Vandal host would have been cut to pieces if the Alan king Respendial had not come to its help*. The Franks were overthrown by their joint forces, and the invaders seem to have met with no further resistance in passing the border stream or in spreading themselves where they would over the whole land. The districts first to be harried were naturally the lands which, under Roman dominion, still bore the German name†,

* This comes from one of the lost writers who were made use of by Gregory of Tours (ii. 9), him who bears the names of Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus, which there, as Gibbon (c. xxx. note 28) remarks, "denote a Christian, a Roman subject, and a semi-barbarian." "Interea Respendial rex Alamannorum, Goare ad Romanos transgresso, de Rheno agmen suorum convertit, Wandalis Francorum bello laborantibus, Godigyselo rege absumpto, acie vigenti ferme millibus ferro peremptis, cunctis Wandalorum ad internitionem delendis, nisi Alamannorum vis in tempore subvenisset." Wietersheim (ii. 158) is of course right in reading "Alanorum" for "Alamannorum." The mistake is more likely to be due to Gregory than to Renatus.

This is the explanation of the two words of Orosius, "Francos proterunt." Of Goar we shall hear again.

Wietersheim points out the error of Procopius (Bell. Vad. i. 3) in making Godegisl lead the Vandals into Spain; "Doch ist dieser Schriftsteller über Führereres anzuverlassig."

† Salvianus, De Gal. vii. 12; "Primam *a solo patrio* effusa est

and which by that name might seem almost to invite the kindred invader. Thence they passed into the specially Belgian land, the Franks, it would seem, no longer withstanding them. Thence they passed into the flourishing land of Aquitaine, and step by step spread themselves over the whole of Gaul, through which they marched and harried as they thought good by the space of three years. Of the sufferings of the land we have more than one vivid picture from contemporary hands. Not the castles perched on the rocks, not the towns crowning the lofty hills, not the cities girded by their rivers—the poet of Divine Providence knew well how to hit off the characteristic features of Gaulish sites—could withstand the craft and the arms of the barbarians *. The head of all, the Imperial dwelling of Constantine and Valentinian, Augusta of the Treveri, shorn now in common speech of its Imperial style, now underwent one of the many sieges and storms that it suffered in that age. All the usual horrors of a sack, fire and sword and leading into captivity, fell on the

in Germaniam primam, nomine barbaram, ditione Romanam; post cujus primum exitium arsit regio Belgarum, deinde opes Aquitanorum luxuriantiam, et post hæc corpus omne Galliarum, sed paullatim id ipsum tamen, ut dum pars clade cæditur, pars exemplo emendaretur." He is here speaking of the Vandals. The words in italics seem quite inconsistent with the notion that these Vandals had formed part of the host of Radagaisus.

* Carmen de Divina Providentia, 35;

"Non castella petris, non oppida montibus altis
Imposita, aut urbes amnibus æquoreis,
Barbarici superare dolos atque arma furoris
Evaluere omnes: ultima pertulimus."

devoted city. The streets ran with blood and were heaped with dead bodies; the buildings were blackened with the flames. We are even told, in the usual style of exaggeration, that the whole city was burned. For it is certain that Trier was not left desolate without an inhabitant. It still remained a city; and, when the storm had passed by, the first thought of its citizens, of the nobles who seem to have escaped the sack, was to send their prayer to the Emperors that the games of the circus might begin once more among them*. We are not told by which of the nations that shared in the invasion this present overthrow of Trier was wrought; nor is any such distinction observed in the case of any of the other towns that are specially named. Mainz, Moguntiacum, was stormed and thousands of its people were slain in the great church †. Venerable

* Salvianus, vi. 15; "Excisa ter continuatis eversionibus summa urbe Gallorum, cum omnis civitas combusta est. . . . Excidio unius urbi adfligebantur quoque aliæ civitates." The horrors are painted in full. Then we read; "Pauci nobiles qui excidio superfuerant, quasi pro summo deletæ urbis remedio circenses ab imperatoribus postulabant." They are then soundly rebuked.

The phrase "ab imperatoribus" would seem to point to the lawful Emperors, Honorius and his colleague, rather than to Constantine or to any other of the tyrants. If so, the petition can hardly have been made for some years, when things may have mended a little. It might be in 409, when Honorius acknowledged Constantine as a colleague. Salvian clearly exaggerates in his description. Trier was certainly not utterly destroyed, as is witnessed by the buildings earlier than this time, the basilica and parts of the metropolitan church among them, which still remain.

† Jerome ad Ageruchiam, xci. *s. a.* 748; "Maguntiacum nobilis

as the present representative of that church is, it does not, like the great church of Trier, itself survive as a witness of those awful times. Vangiones, Worms, fell after a long siege; we might even infer that for a while the city ceased to exist. Rheims, Amiens, Arras—the tribal name had already supplanted the name of the city—Nemetæ and Argentoratum, cities to be more famous under their later names of Speyer and Strassburg, suffered the same havoc as Trier and Mainz. The Morini, most distant of mankind, did not escape in their home at Terouanne. Of the towns of northern Gaul no other, save Tournay, is named; but the like havoc went on through the whole country. None escaped save a few of the towns of the Lyonnese and Narbonnese provinces, of Aquitaine and of Novempopulania, the later Gascony. One city alone of the south is specially mentioned; Toulouse was in some way spared yet greater sufferings by its bishop Exsuperius, but the griefs which the city did undergo brought tears to the eyes of those who heard of them *. Heathens and heretics cared nought

quondam civitas capta atque subversa est, et in ecclesia multa hominum millia trucidata." He does not speak of Trier.

* Ib. "Vangiones longa obsidione deleti. Remorum urbs præpotens, Ambiani, Atrabatæ, extremique hominum Morini, Tornacum, Nemetæ, Argentoratum, translati in Germaniam. Aquitaniæ, Novemque Populorum, Lugdunensis et Narbonensis provinciæ, præter paucas urbes populata sunt cuncta. . . . Non possum absque lacrimis Tolosæ facere mentionem, quæ ut hucusque non fueret sancti episcopi Exsuperii merita præstiterunt." In his next letter to Julian, Jerome describes his correspondent's losses and sufferings through an incursion of barbarians which seems to be the same.

for sacred places, kings and persons, for the hallowed church and its vessels, for the devout widow, for the consecrated virgin, for the hermit who had withdrawn from the world to serve God in his solitary cave. Barbarians, we are told, cared not for age or sex; they slew the innocent children with no more mercy than those whose death might be the just punishment for the sins of a longer life*. Those who escaped the sword escaped it only to pass into bondage. The sufferings of the clergy are told by one of their own body. They were scourged with whips, branded, loaded with chains. The poet himself had to march under the rod along the hard and dusty road among the wagons and weapons of the barbarians, while his aged bishop, torn from his burned city, led his people like the banished shepherd of a flock of wounded sheep†. As usual one plague followed on another;

* Carmen de Providentia, 41;

"Majores anni ne forte et nequior ætas
Offenso tulerint quæ meruere Deo:
Quid pueri insontes, quid commisere puellæ
Nulla quibus dederat crimina vita brevis?
Quare templa Dei licuit popularier igni?
Cur violata sacri vasa ministerii?
Non honor innuptas devotæ virginitatis,
Non texit viduas relligionis amor.
Ipsi desertis qui vitam ducere in antris
Luerant, laudantes nocte dieque Deum,
Non aliam subiere necem quam quisque profanus;
Idem turbo bonos sustulit atque malos."

† Ib. 53;

"Nulla sacerdotes reverentia nominis almi
Diseruit miseri suppliciis populi;

if leading into captivity was the fate of those whom the sword spared, the sharp hunger came in the end to slay them who escaped leading into captivity *. Three years of havoc like this wasted the land. No help could come for Rome or Ravenna. The something which professed to be help came from another quarter, though in truth the help rather took the shape of adding the curse of civil war to the curse of barbarian invasion.

The troops that still kept Britain for Rome passed over into Gaul. Britain was lost; we can hardly say that Gaul was saved. The barbarians presently passed on to ravage another Roman land, and so

> Sic duris cæsi flagris, sic igne perusti,
> Inclusæ vinclis sic gemuere manus.
> Tu quoque pulvereus plaustra inter et arce Getarum
> Carpebas duram hoc sine fasce viam,
> Cum sacer ille senex plebem usta pulsus ab urbe,
> Cum pastor laceras duceret exsul oves."

"Tu" seems to be the poet himself. He had said;

> "Heu cæde decenni
> Vandalicis gladiis sternimur et Geticis."

The ten years would count from the invasion in 406 to the peace and restoration of Placidia in 416. It is possible therefore that the description of himself and his bishop may belong to a later time than 406–7, and that "Getæ" should be taken in the strict sense of "Goths." Yet the picture would seem to refer to an incursion of altogether untamed barbarians rather than to the movements of the comparatively civilized West-Goths.

* Jerome, u. s. "Quas [urbes] ut ipsas foris gladius intus vastat fames." One thinks of the picture drawn in our own tongue (Chron. 1086), "Ða þa wreccæ men lægen fordrifene full neah to deaðe, and siððan com se scearpa hungor and adyde hi mid ealle."

much of Gaul as clave to the Roman name was left to be torn in pieces by adventurer after adventurer who rose up to take his chance of winning the rule of Gaul or, if his luck carried him so far, the rule of the whole Western World.

II.

[A TYRANT OF THE WEST.]

We have thus far seen the more part of Gaul harried by invaders, both Teutonic and otherwise, from beyond the Rhine. From the sufferings of another land, from the doings, partly of strangers, partly of more distant kinsfolk, we must turn for a moment to look at the doings of our own people, we must turn for a somewhat longer time to look at the fates of the land which the doings of our own people were before long to make our own land. One annalist of this time, not to be sure the one highest in authority, but the one who seems to have kept his eye most steadily fixed on the matters which most immediately concern ourselves, speaks of Gaul at this time as a land ravaged, not only by Vandals and Alans, but also by Saxons *. Now fully to under-

* The Pseudo-Prosper, or whatever we are to call him, has under the sixteenth year of Honorius (409) this entry; "Saxonum incursione devastatam Galliarum partem Wanali atque Alani vastavere; quod reliquum fuerat Constantinus tyrannus obsidet." The entry is odd; he had mentioned (see above, note, p. 26) the invasion of 406 in its right place, but without the mention of Vandals, Alans, or any nations by name. And one does not see why he specially places the harrying of Gaul by Vandals and Alans in the year in which they left Gaul. Still he could hardly have imagined a Saxon inroad, if none had taken place; and he

stand the course of things in the fifth century, it is ever needful to bear in mind that the events which led to the settlement of Angles and Saxons in the isle of Britain, and thereby to the growth of the English nation in that isle, do not stand alone. They form part, we should never forget, no less than the settlements of Burgundians, Franks, and Goths, of the great tale of the Wandering of the Nations. But the story of the Angles and Saxons differs widely in every detail from the story of the Franks and Burgundians. How far is the difference marked by the distinction which has for many ages divided the Teutonic race into the two great branches of High and Low? It might be hard to say how far that distinction, a distinction which we may most truly describe as the parting off of the later High-Dutch forms from the elder forms common to Goth and Saxon, had already gone in those days. The later Franks, the Eastern Franks, the Franks of the Carolingian age, appear as a High-Dutch people, at any rate as a people ruled by kings whose speech is High-Dutch. But the names borne by the kings of the Merowingian house distinctly keep the Nether-Dutch forms *, and the first settlements of the Franks, those at least

connects it with the Vandal invasion, seemingly placing it a little earlier. And the entry of this year strangely connects itself with the entry of the year before, to which we shall presently come again. Most likely he is right in his facts and confused in his dates.

* The names for instance beginning with *Theod-* take essentially the same shape that they would in Gothic or English. The *thorn* lives ever, in writing at least, in the French forms of Thierry and Thibault. So in *Chilpe*-ric we have the Low-Dutch form *help-*.

which mark their first appearance in trustworthy history, are found in those lands on both sides of Rhine which, wherever the speech of the people has been allowed to abide, are Nether-Dutch still. To Gregory of Tours the city which had been Argentoratum was still Nether-Dutch Strateburg *. The difference is most likely merely one of chronology; when the first Frankish conquests began, High-Dutch was not yet, and Chlodwig, no less than Alaric, spoke a tongue essentially the same as our own. But if the Saxon and the Frank were still all but one in point of language, their conditions and their relations to other men were widely different. There is already a wide gap between the Northern and the Southern German; we might rather say between the German of the sea and the German of the land. The German of the land is already either an ally of the Empire, serving in its armies and loaded with its honours, or else he is an experienced invader of its continental provinces. Very often he flits to and fro between the two characters; but in either or both he has become familiar with Roman things; even as an enemy he is not untouched with admiration and reverence for the state of things into the midst of which he forces his way. In the Gaulish wars of the fifth century the Frank steadily appears as the ally of Rome, till he finds it convenient to overthrow the last remnant of Roman authority in Gaul, and that, it may be, in the character of the officer of a lawful Emperor overthrowing the rule of a tyrant †.

* Greg. Tur. ix. 36, x. 19.

† It is, to say the least, worth arguing whether Chlodwig did

All the incursions of the Franks, like those of the Goths, are made by land. Both Franks and Goths have been heard of on the water in earlier days *; but on the water they wrought only sudden and passing exploits; the historic life of both those nations was wholly a life by land. Altogether unlike them in this age are the northern Germans, the Germans of the sea, the men who have not been brought within the magic circle of Roman friendship and Roman enmity, who have yet to be taught that feeling towards the mighty past of the Empire and its still abiding present which was felt alike by the heathen Frank and the Arian Goth. I said that they had not been brought within the magic circle of Roman enmity any more than within that of Roman friendship. They had indeed felt, alike in Gaul and on the coasts of Britain, the might of Rome when Rome was ruled by Valentinian †; but they had simply been beaten back in isolated invasions; the German of the sea had not gone through the same unbroken apprenticeship to Roman ways which the German of the land found as much in his warfare against Rome as in his warfare under the Roman banners. The main cause of the difference doubtless lay in the fact that he was the German of the sea. The Saxons of this age answer to the Danes and Northmen of the ninth and tenth centuries, in whom,

not overthrow Syagrius in the character of an officer of the Emperor Zeno.

* See Aurelius Victor, Cæsares 23, Zosimos, 1.

† See the Saxon wars of Valentinian's reign in Ammianus, xxvii. 8, xxviii. 2, 5.

after an interval of some ages, the heathen and seafaring Teutonic warrior again comes to life. But the Danes and Northmen come on us as a kind of second outburst of the great Wandering after a lull of centuries; the Saxon expeditions and settlements of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries are as essentially a part of the first great movement as the marches of Alaric; they form one special side of it, a side that has a character of its own, but both are alike parts of the same great drama. Specially must it be borne in mind that the Saxon inroads of the fifth century, just like the Scandinavian inroads of the ninth, touched both sides of the Channel alike, and that settlements were made on both sides alike. The Saxon of the fifth century seems to have been before all things a haunter of the Channel; we do not hear of him now, as we do at a time a little earlier *, as threatening the shores of Northern Britain. It is the British sea, the sea which parted Gaul and Britain, which was his special home; it was there that it was his sport to cleave the wave with his light barks clothed, not yet with iron, but with the skins of slaughtered oxen; there it was that the men of Armorica were ever looking for him as the sea-rover who was to bring desolation to their coasts †. Yet he did not always keep himself within

* See the passages from Claudian collected in N. C. i. 11; "Maduerunt Saxone fuso Orcades," &c.

† Sidonius, Pan. in Avitum, 369;

"Quin et Aremoricus piratam Saxona tractus
Sperabat, cui pelle salum sulcare Britannum
Ludus, et assuto glaucum mare findere lembo.

the narrow seas; he could brave the strength of Ocean himself, and show himself as a sudden enemy on the western coast of Gaul *. In the eyes of the men on whose shores they showed themselves every Saxon was a sea-robber, a chief of sea-robbers; plunder was the one trade which they all learned; it was the one work which the leaders enforced, and which the followers undertook with gladness †. The Saxon was an enemy at once fiercer and more wary than all other enemies; he was schooled in shipwrecks; no danger daunted him; he fell suddenly on those who did not look for him; he escaped in safety from those who was looking out for his coming ‡. The gods of his bloody creed called for the

> Francus Germanum primum Belgamque secundum
> Sternebat, Rhenumque, ferox Alamanne, bibebas
> Romanis ripis."

The advance of the Saxons by sea and of the other nations by land is here well marked.

* See the letter of Sidonius to Nammatius (Ep. viii. 3, ed. Baret), where he gives a picture of the Saxon sea-rovers (cf. Hodgkin, Invaders of Italy, ii. 366). News is brought from Saintes that his friend was called upon "littoribus Oceani curvis inerrare contra Saxonum pandos myoparones." Much learning about the "myoparones" will be found at p. 506 and p. 98 of the old edition of Sidonius by Savaron. Some seem to make the "myoparones" mere coracles, such as seem to be implied in the word "pelle" in the extract in the last note. Others, who are surely right, make them much larger ships, doubtless the "lembi" of the same extract, the Illyrian λέμβοι of which we read so often in Polybios. They are, I presume, the "keels" of our own story.

† Ib.; "Saxonum . . . quorum quot remiges videris, totidem te cernere putes archipiratas; ita simul omnes imperant, parent, docent, discunt latrocinari."

‡ Ib.; "Hostis est omni hoste truculentior. Improvisus aggre-

slaughter and torture of his captives; when he was about to turn his sails from the mainland to his own home, he deemed it a sacred duty to pick out one man out of every ten to perish by a cruel death as the thank-offering of their captor's piety *. So did our fathers look in the eyes of the man who has made the Gaul of the fifth century a living thing for all time. That the Saxon in these days never appears as the ally of Rome is hardly needful to say. While the Frank fights under the Imperial banner, the Saxon leagues himself with the Goth as the enemy of both †.

It is important to notice that the Saxons of these days, inhabitants, one might almost say, of the British seas, not only harried on both sides of the

ditur, prævisus elabitur: spernit objectos, sternit incautos; si sequatur, intercipit, si fugiat, evadit. Ad hoc exercent illos naufragia, non terrent. Est eis quædam cum discriminibus pelagi non notitia solum sed familiaritas."

* Ib.; "Priusquam *de continenti in patriam* vela laxantes, hostico mordaces ancoras vado vellant, mos est remeaturis decimum quemque captorum per æquales et cruciarias pœnas, plus ob hoc tristi quod superstitioso ritu necare, superque collectam turbam periturorum mortis iniquitatem sortis æquitate dispergere. Talibus eligunt votis, victimis solvunt; et per hujusmodi non tam sacrificia purgati quam sacrilegia polluti, religiosum putant cædis infaustæ perpetratores, de capite captivo magis exigere tormenta quam pretia."

Orosius also (vii. 32) paints our early picture; "Saxonum gentem in oceani littoribus et paludibus inviis sitam, virtute atque agilitate terribilem, periculosam Romanis finibus."

† In the complicated alliances in Gaul between 463 and 468 (see Greg. Tur. ii. 18) we find Romans, Franks, and Britons on one side, Goths and Saxons on the other.

Channel, but established themselves on both sides. The Saxon of Bayeux and the later Saxon of Winchester were colonists who went forth as parts of one general movement, and just as among the Scandinavians of a later time, the same keels often show themselves on both sides of the narrow seas. The results of the settlements have indeed been widely different in the two cases. The coming of the Saxons, along with the kindred Jutes and Angles, of whom, by those names at least, we hear nothing in Gaul, wholly changed the face of Britain. The face of Gaul was immeasureably less changed than the face of Britain, and, so far as it was changed, it was mainly the Frank who changed it. In the new Teutonic Britain which the events of this century called into being, the Saxon is one of the two great elements alongside of the kindred Angle. In Gaul we must always remember that the Saxon is a real element in the mixed population; but he is a very subordinate element. His work was local and temporary. He kept a field ready for the coming of the Norman. The Scandinavian invaders of Gaul in the ninth century, the Scandinavian settlers in Gaul in the tenth, found a land already partly Teutonic to receive them; the truest Normandy, Normandy west of Dives, is specially Norman because it is partly Saxon. One main reason which made the Saxon settlements in Britain so much greater and more lasting than those in Gaul was doubtless that in Britain the Saxons and their fellow-invaders by sea, Anglian and Jutish, had the field to themselves. They came in small parties, a few

keels at a time; but they had no Teutonic rivals in Britain, like Goths, Burgundians, and Franks in Gaul, coming by land, and naturally coming in far greater bodies. In Gaul therefore Saxon settlements were small and scattered, and they were gradually merged in the greater Teutonic elements in the country. In Britain they were also small and scattered, but there was nothing to interfere with their growth, except the resistance which they might meet from the Roman and Celtic elements in the land. From the Celtic element in Britain, Saxons and Angles did indeed meet a long and stubborn resistance, such as none of the Teutonic conquerors of Gaul met from any enemy. The Teutonic kingdoms in Gaul were founded in a moment; all save one fell in a moment. The Teutonic kingdoms in Britain, so much smaller in extent, were the work of generations; and they did not fall, but were merged into a single kindred whole. But the main difference of all is that in Britain the Teutonic conquerors displaced the Celtic and Roman inhabitants in a way that they never did in Gaul. They did, not only as in Gaul, form one element among the people of the land; they became the people of the land itself. They made the land England in a sense in which Gaul never became Gothic or Burgundy, or even France. Some of the causes which led the way to the wide difference between Teutonic settlement on the northern and the southern sides of the Channel will meet us in the chain of events which we have just now reached.

The same annalist who speaks thus casually of

Saxon harryings in Gaul of which we have no other record, does not directly connect that harrying with anything that happened in Britain; but he has a remarkable entry the year before, the meaning of which seems to be that the Roman power in Britain then practically came to an end *. This entry would seem to be meant as a short summary of a chain of stirring events of which we can, by the help of writers who record things more at length, put together something like a continuous narrative. Britain, the other world, was stirred, as Honorius himself was stirred, by the great movement of the Teutonic nations beyond the Rhine. We may perhaps venture to guess that the Saxon harrying of Gaul, so darkly hinted at, had already taken place, and that it had been accompanied by some Saxon harryings in Britain. However this may be, the legions in Britain, forsaken by their Emperors at Ravenna, feared lest the storm which was sweeping over Gaul should spread to Britain also †. In such a case they took the law into their own hands. While the Germans and Alans were gathering, while Honorius was calling on the patriots of Gaul to arm, the army of Britain chose an Emperor, a tyrant, of their own, Marcus by name. The step was not new.

* This is the famous entry in the so-called Prosper Tiro under the fifteenth year of Honorius (408); "Hac tempestati præ valetudine [al. viribus] Romanorum vires funditus attenuatæ Britanniæ." The reading is doubtful, and the phrases anyhow are odd; but there seems no doubt as to the general meaning.

† The well-known saying of Jerome, Ep. xlii. ad Ctesiphontem (vol. iv. p. 481), "Britannia fertilis provincia tyrannorum."

Britain was already known as a land fruitful in tyrants *. There Carausius and Allectus had reigned;

* Olympiodôros, p. 451; *ἐν ταύταις ταῖς Βρεταννίαις, πρὶν ἢ Ὀνώριον τὸ ἕβδομον ὑπατεῦσαι, ἐς στάσιν ὁρμῆσαν τὸ ἐν αὐταῖς στρατιωτικὸν, Μάρκον τινα ἀνεῖπον αὐτοκράτορα.* As Wietersheim (ii. 160) remarks, the date is fixed to 406, as the seventh consulship of Honorius was 407. We thus see the effect of the mere movement of these nations before they actually crossed the Rhine. Olympiodôros tells the story out of place to account for the elevation of Constantine, yet this date so carefully given must surely be trustworthy. It most likely marks the revolt as taking place late in the year 406, perhaps while the two Augusti were already *consules designati*. Zôsimos in his later account (vi. 2—he has two earlier references to Constantine) seems not to have noticed the force of *πρό*, and places the elevation of Marcus in the seventh consulship, or 407; *Ἔτι βασιλεύοντος Ἀρκαδίου καὶ ὑπάτων ὄντων Ὀνωρίου τὸ ἕβδομον καὶ Θεοδοσίου τὸ δεύτερον, οἱ ἐν τῇ Βρετανν[ί]ᾳ στρατευόμενοι στασιάσαντες ἀνάγουσι Μάρκον ἐπὶ τὸν βασίλειον θρόνον καὶ ὡς κρατοῦντι τῶν αὐτόθι πραγμάτων ἐπείθοντο.* Then, in the same chapter, he goes on to describe Constantine's crossing into Gaul (which he had already recorded in v. 27) and a good deal of what he did there. Then (vi. 3) he goes back to record the migration of 406, and then comes to the election of Marcus a second time. The Vandals, Suevians, and Alans harry Gaul, *καὶ πολὺν ἐργασάμενοι φόνον ἐπίφοβοι καὶ τοῖς ἐν Βρετανν[ί]αις στρατοπέδοις ἐγένοντο, συνηνάγκασαν δὲ, δέει τοῦ μὴ κἀπὶ σφᾶς προελθεῖν, εἰς τὴν τῶν τυράννων ὁρμῆσαι χειροτονίαν, Μάρκου λέγω καὶ Γρατιανοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις Κωνσταντίνου.* So Sôzomen (ix. 11), who takes a more general view; *ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον* [the taking of Rome] *πολλῶν ἀνισταμένων τυράννων ἐν τῇ πρὸς δύσιν ἀρχῇ, οἱ μὲν πρὸς ἀλλήλων πίπτοντες, οἱ δὲ παραδόξως συλλαμβανόμενοι, οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν ἐπεμαρτύρουν Ὀνωρίῳ θεοφίλειαν. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οἱ ἐν Βρεττανί[ᾳ] στασιάσαντες στρατιῶται, ἀναγορεύουσι Μάρκον τύραννον· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Γρατιανὸν, ἀνελόντες Μάρκον· ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ οὗτος οὐ πλέον τεσσάρων μηνῶν διελθόντων ἐφονεύθη παρ' αὐτῶν, πάλιν Κωνσταντῖνον χειροτονοῦσιν· οἰηθέντες καθότι ταύτην εἶχε προσηγορίαν καὶ βεβαίως αὐτὸν κρατήσειν τὴν βασιλείαν· ἐκ τοιαύτης γὰρ αἰτίας φαίνονται καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐς τυραννίδα ἐπιλεξάμενοι.* This seems to imply that Marcus and Gratian, as well as Constantine, were chosen on account

thence Maximus had gone forth to occupy Gaul and to threaten Italy; thence the great Constantine himself had gone forth to win the diadem of the world, with the risk that, if he had failed to win it, he too might have been handed down in history simply as one of the same class as Maximus. But Marcus was not as Constantine; he was not as Maximus or as Carausius. He and his electors failed to agree*; he was speedily slain; a man of the province was next chosen, who bore one of the names current in the house of Theodosius. But the British Gratian was also killed after a reign of four months, and in the course of the next year, the year of the seventh consulship of Honorius, a choice which lasted somewhat longer was made. A private soldier was chosen, recommended, we are told, by no merit except that he bore the name of the most lucky of his predecessors in the choice of a British army. Another Constantine was chosen, in the hope that his great name would bring good luck with it; and he was hailed as Augustus in the island where the first bearer of it had been first so hailed†. We hear of the acts of

of their imperial names. It must be remembered that several of our authorities leave out Marcus and Gratian, and begin the British story with the elevation of Constantine.

* Olympiodôros says only, *τοῦ δὲ* [*Μάρκου*] *ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀναιρεθέντος*, Zôsimos in a more marked way, *ἀνελόντες τοῦτον ὡς οὐχ ὁμολογοῦντα τοῖς αὐτῶν ἤθεσι.* One would like to know in what the difference lay.

† Olymp. u. s.; *Γρατιανὸς αὐτοῖς ἀντικαθίσταται, ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ οὗτος εἰς τετράμηνον αὐτοῖς προσκορὴς γεγονὼς ἀπεσφάγη, Κωνσταντῖνος τότε εἰς τὸ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος ἀναβιβάζεται ὄνομα.* So Zôsimos (vi. 2); *ἄγουσι Γρατιανὸν εἰς μέσον καὶ ἁλουργίδα καὶ στέφανον ἐπιθέντες ἐδορυφόρουν ὡς βασιλέα·*

Constantine only from his enemies; their portrait is of course unfavourable; yet he must have differed in some way from his two momentary predecessors; he must at least have had some strength of character to do all that he did, and to bear up for several years against enemies of all kinds and from all quarters. The tale of his first acts is but darkly told, or rather the facts are fairly clear, but it is less easy to judge of causes and motives. Almost

δυσαρεστήσαντες δὲ καὶ τούτῳ τέσσαρσιν ὕστερον μησὶ παραλύσαντες ἀναιροῦσι, Κωνσταντίνῳ παραδόντες τὴν βασιλείαν. Sôzomen has been quoted already in note, p. 45. Orosius (vii. 40) leaves out Marcus, but mentions Gratian; "His [Halanis, Wandalis, et Suevis] per Gallias bacchantibus apud Britannias Gratianus municeps ejusdem insulæ tyrannus creatur et occiditur. Hujus loco Constantinus ex infima militia, propter solam spem nominis sine merito virtutis eligitur." This looks as if Gratian was not a soldier, but a native or inhabitant of Britain of whatever class. It is possible that the four months of Gratian came wholly within the year 407, in which case the harrying of Gaul would have begun before his election. Prosper does not mention either Marcus or Gratian; but he gives the right date for the elevation of Constantine; "Honorio vii et Theodosio ii Coss. Constantinus ex infima militia, ob solam speciem nominis in Britannia tyrannus exoritur, et in Gallias transit." Idatius does not trouble himself about British or Gaulish matters, though he has much to say when the invaders reach Spain. Marcellinus knows nothing about them till 411, when he says "Constantinus apud Gallias invasit imperium," and goes on with his later story.

To these we may in a manner add Zôsimos in his first account of Constantine, v. 27 (see below, note, p. 49). One is tempted to think that he knew nothing about Marcus and Gratian till he wrote the latter account. It would almost seem as if nothing was known in Italy of the movements in Britain till Constantine had actually landed in Gaul.

the first act of the British tyrant was to forsake his island and to carry the legions across to Gaul. Of his motives for this step we are told nothing. We may read the tale in several ways. Some of the expressions used in describing the elevation of Marcus almost read like a formal secession from Rome and the establishment of a separate empire in Britain. But, if such notions were really held the year before, they certainly had no place in the policy of Constantine. It might rather seem that his object was to preserve the unity of the Empire, at any rate the unity of its provinces beyond the Alps. In this view it might be a wise course not to wait to be attacked in the island, but to cross to the mainland and to deal a blow at the enemy on what he was fast making his own ground. Britain might thus be saved by a campaign in Gaul. But if this was the motive, the thought of saving Britain must soon have passed away from the minds of Constantine and his soldiers. Whether they cared for such an object or not, the course of things on the mainland soon made it hopeless for them to think of keeping up any relations with the great island. The crossing of Constantine into Gaul thus became the end of the Roman power in Britain *.

He landed at that Bononia of northern Gaul, once Gessoriacum, which, though not the starting-point

* The words of Olympiodôros (p. 451) are noteworthy; *τὰς Βρεττανίας ἐάσας, περαιοῦται ἅμα τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Βονωνίαν.* The phrase of Zôsimos (vi. 2) *τὴν Βρεττανίαν καταλιπών* is hardly so expressive; but of course neither was meant to convey the whole of its full meaning.

of Cæsar, has been in all ages one of the chief points of passage between the island and the mainland *. He brought with him, it would seem, the whole of the Roman force with which Britain had been held or defended. It was under the command of two generals, Justinian or Justin, and Neobigast, and it would seem that it was put under their command before the army left Britain †. Of their names, the one is clearly Roman, the other clearly Frankish, and we shall presently see that Constantine was on good terms with others of the Frankish allies or subjects of Rome. His stay at Boulogne was not long; but it is hard to trace his course in the early stages of his advance. He presently gathered under his obedience whatever troops were to be found in Gaul, whether Frankish allies, legionaries who had been left behind by Stilicho, or patriots who had answered the summons of Honorius the year before ‡. The

* Olympiodôros (p. 451) describes Boulogne as Βονωνία, *πόλις οὕτω καλουμένη, παραθαλασσία καὶ πρώτη ἐν τοῖς τῶν* Γαλλιῶν *ὁρίοις κειμένη.* The description of Zôsimos (vi. 2) is more remarkable; *πρώτη δὲ αὕτη πρὸς τῇ θαλάσσῃ κεῖται,* Γερμανίας *οὖσα πόλις τῆς κάτω.* One is reminded of his description of Paris (iii. 9) as Γερμανίας *πολίχνη.*

† Olympiodôros at least says, Ἰουστῖνον *καὶ* Νεοβιγάστην *στρατηγοὺς προβαλόμενος καὶ τὰς* Βρεταννίας *ἐάσας, περαιοῦται.* Zôsimos' words are, *ὁ δὲ* Ἰουστινιανὸν *καὶ* Νεβιογάστην *ἄρχειν τῶν ἐν* Κέλτοις *στρατιωτῶν ἐπεραιώθη.* It would almost seem as if they crossed before their master. Nebiogast is clearly a Frankish name, like Arbogast and like the four sages of the Salian Law, Wisogast, Bodogast [or Arogast], Saligast, and Windogast. A. Holder, Lex Salica (St. Gallen MS. 731 and Ed. Heroldina), Leipzig, 1880.

‡ Olympiodôros, u. s.; *ἔνθα* [*ἐν* Βονωνίᾳ] *διατρίψας καὶ ὅλον τὸν* Γάλλον *καὶ* Ἀκύτανον *στρατιώτην ἰδιοποιησάμενος.* The opposition between Gaul and Aquitaine is curious. So Zôsimos; *πάντα οἰκειασάμενος τὰ*

authority of Honorius was represented in Gaul by the Præfect Limenius and the general Chariobaudes*. The name of this last speaks for his barbarian birth; we seem to see in him an English Herebald. Of their action at the moment of invasion we hear nothing. These names appear only at a later stage, when we are told that they had fled before the tyrant. But at what stage of his course they fled, and whether they offered any armed resistance to the invader before they fled, on these points we are left wholly in the dark. On the whole the chances are against any fighting between the followers of Constantine and any who remained loyal to Honorius. Our authorities are most confused; but on the whole the story reads as if so much of Gaul as still obeyed any Roman prince at all submitted to Constantine without a blow.

The mission of the new prince, the object which

στρατεύματα μέχρι τῶν Ἀλπέων ὄντα. He makes them stay at Boulogne only a short time, διατρίψας ἡμέρας τινάς. Zôsimos writes through the whole story as if he got his facts from Olympiodôros, but thought he could improve his language.

* These two officers are mentioned by Zôsimos in his casual way at a later stage, namely at the time when they are murdered; v. 32. The soldiers (see p. 5) τρόπον τινὰ παράφοροι γεγονότες Λιμένιόν τε τὸν ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ τὰς Ἄλπεις ἔθνεσιν ὄντα τῆς αὐλῆς ὕπαρχον ἀποσφάττουσι, καὶ ἅμα τούτῳ Χαριοβαύδην τὸν στρατηγὸν τῶν ἐκεῖσε ταγμάτων· ἔτυχον γὰρ διαφυγόντες τὸν τύραννον καὶ ὑπαντήσαντες κατὰ τὸ Τίκηνον τῷ βασιλεῖ. Now Honorius does not seem to have been at Ticinum till 408. If therefore Limenius and Chariobaudes went straight from Gaul to the presence of the Emperor, their flight must have been later, at least not till Constantine had reached Arles. But with such a writer as Zôsimos one cannot feel certain one way or another. See Fauriel, i. 55.

had brought him from Britain into Gaul, was in some way or other to act against the barbarians who were in full force in Gaul, and who were held to threaten Britain. But it is hard to make out his exact relations, either in war or peace, with the barbarians either within or without the Empire, partly perhaps because our authorities take but little pains to distinguish one set of barbarians from another. According to one version, the army of Constantine saw some sharp service against barbarian enemies, and that seemingly not very long after his landing. We hear of a great battle fought by him or under his auspices, which began with a marked Roman success of which the Roman commanders failed to make the most. The barbarians fled; had the Romans pursued, the enemy might have been cut to pieces; but, as the soldiers or their leaders failed to pursue, the barbarians recovered strength and courage, and, by the accession of new forces, they were enabled to hold themselves at least on equal terms with Constantine *. Of this fighting we are not told the place nor the exact time, nor yet the nationality of the particular enemy. But the story sounds as if the fighting had happened on the frontier against some fresh swarm of barbarians who were striving to make their way into Gaul. For our

* I see no sign of all this fighting anywhere but in Zôsimos, vi. 3, but it may well come from a lost piece of Olympiodôros; *πρὸς ὃν* [Κωνσταντῖνον] *μάχης καρτερᾶς γενομένης ἐνίκων μὲν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι, τὸ πολὺ τῶν βαρβάρων κατασφάξαντες μέρος, τοῖς δὲ φεύγουσιν οὐκ ἐπεξελθόντες* (*ἦ γὰρ ἂν ἅπαντας πανωλεθρίᾳ διέφθειραν*) *ἐνέδωκαν αὐτοῖς ἀνακτησαμένοις τὴν ἧτταν καὶ βαρβάρων πλῆθος συναγαγοῦσιν ἀξιομάχους γενέσθαι.*

informant goes on to say that Constantine placed guards on the borders and secured the whole course of the Rhine. It is a zealous pagan who speaks; his mind goes back to the days of the hero of his own creed, and he tells us, with some injustice both to the strong reign of Valentinian and to the more recent exploits of Stilicho, that Constantine guarded the Rhine as it had never been guarded since the days of Julian *.

On the other hand, the new Emperor or tyrant stands charged with doing the republic great damage by allowing himself to be many times cheated by the barbarians by treaties, vague, it would seem, in their terms, and not strictly kept †. This, we may be sure, refers to the barbarians who were already in Gaul, the Vandals, Suevians, and Alans. Some understanding between them and Constantine, there must have been. For two years they and he carry on their operations in Gaul, each, it would seem, without any interruption from the other. And when the scene of action is moved from Gaul to Spain, each party carries on its operations there also with as little of mutual let or hindrance. It was most likely only by winking at their presence and at their doings that Constantine obtained possession, so far as Roman troops and Roman administration were

* Zôsimos, vi. 3; *διὰ ταῦτα τοίνυν τούτοις τοῖς τόποις φύλακας ἐγκατέστησε Κωνσταντῖνος, ὡς ἂν μὴ τὴν εἰς Γαλατίαν ἀνειμένην ἔχοιεν πάραδον. ἐγκατέστησε δὲ καὶ τῷ Ῥήνῳ πᾶσαν ἀσφάλειαν, ἐκ τῶν Ἰουλιανοῦ βασιλέως χρόνων ῥαθυμηθεῖσαν.*

† Orosius, vii. 40; "Ibi [in Galliis] sæpe a barbaris incertis fœderibus illusus detrimento magis reipublicæ fuit."

concerned, of all Gaul from the Channel to the Alps. Certain it is that, at no very long time after his landing, before the end of the year 407, he was possessed of it*. But at that moment no Roman prince could be possessed of much authority in central or western Gaul, where Vandals, Suevians, and Alans were ravaging at pleasure. The dominions of Constantine must have consisted of a long and narrow strip of eastern Gaul, from the Channel to the Mediterranean, which could not have differed very widely from the earliest and most extended of the many uses of the word Lotharingia. He held the Imperial city on the Mosel, the home of Valentinian and the earlier Constantine. Trier, ever ready to rise again from her ashes, rose this time among others, and Constantine may have been, though at a somewhat later time, one of the princes to whom her citizens made their prayer for the restoration of their darling games †. Certain it is, from the sure evidence of coins struck there in his name, that he was the acknowledged Emperor in the Treveran Augusta ‡. The palace of Valentinian, the mighty basilica, the venerable church, as yet in its first and untouched state, the bridge that yokes the river sung by

* As far as one can make anything out from the confused and casual statement of Zôsimos (v. 27), Constantine was looked on as practically master of Gaul before the end of 407. But compare this passage with another in v. 31; this looks as if at the moment just spoken of he was not as yet in actual possession of Arles.

† See above, p. 30.

‡ On the coins of Constantine struck at Trier, see Clinton in an. 407, and Jahn, Geschichte der Burgundionen, i. 288.

Ausonius, all that we look down on from the wooded hills that guard the Imperial head of Gaul, all had passed into the possession, and we cannot doubt that it must for a while have beheld the presence, of a third adventurer from Britain.

Of those three adventurers the second had perished. Maximus was recorded in history simply as a tyrant; but one Constantine had marched from Britain and from Trier to the highest pitch of power and glory, and another might be destined to equal luck. It did not suit the purposes of Constantine to establish the chief seat of his power by the Rhine or the Mosel. He could perhaps, he thought, deal more easily with the barbarians beyond the Rhine than with the rival Emperor beyond the Alps. The chief seat of his new dominion must be nearer to Italy. From henceforth we hear of him chiefly or only in the south-eastern corner of Gaul, the land which was soon to take a new name from its Burgundian conquerors. The land between the Rhone and the Alps, whose renowned cities still live to awe and teach us by the greatness of their Roman works, now becomes the main centre of our tale. Italy, Aquitaine, Britain, even Spain, are for us little more than scenes of occasional episodes. Each of the cities by the broad and rushing stream seems called on in these strange times to stand a siege in the cause of some Emperor or tyrant, and commonly to behold his end. And one city, the foremost of them all since Phokaian Massalia had sunk for a while to a secondary place, was specially bound up with the reign and fate of Constantine. Hardly when the

first news came of his crossing the Channel, but at the time when his rival of Rome and Ravenna began to take counsel against him, one sign of the nearness and greatness of the danger was that Constantine reigned in Arelate. The city that was in after-days to give its name to a kingdom was then at the height of its greatness. Its wealth, its splendour, its commerce, that brought to it the good things of every quarter of the world, were sung in the verses of poets and recorded in the edicts of Emperors *. Not then, as now, sitting by the side of one mighty stream, but like Ravenna then, like Venice now, floating on many waters, untouched by the blows which were fast falling on Imperial Trier, Arles, now so sadly fallen from its ancient greatness, stood high among the cities of Europe, ready to take the place presently to be granted to it in form, of the head of all the Gauls †. Already did the walls of which such mighty relics abide shelter the dwelling-places of the living; already did the Elysian Fields, now narrowed and dishonoured, shelter the long line of the tombs, alike of pagan and Christian dead; theatre and amphitheatre lifted their bulk, still whole and perfect, the mass of the arena soaring as now above the city, still the home of the savage sports of warfare, but not yet a house of war, its outline as yet unbroken by the towers reared, some say during the momentary possession of the Arab, some say to

* Ausonius, Ordo Nobilium Urbium.

† See the Edict of Honorius in the Theodosian Code. It is printed also in Duchèsne, i. 85. Cf. Cass. Var. viii. 10. On the old position of Arles with regard to the waters, see Ch. Lenthéric.

hinder his possession from being more than momentary. Some great basilica fresh from the builders' hands must have rivalled the glories of Rome and Ravenna, on the spot where now stands the imperial church, the dome where the crown that was specially the crown of Arles was set on the head of that Frederick who granted the Peace of Constance and that Charles who signed the most renowned of Golden Bulls. And if as yet Arles could not as in after-days boast of the imperial church, she could boast of an imperial palace. Already by the Rhone stood the still abiding tower, a fragment now of a vast pile that has crumbled into ruin, the tower which still bears the name of the earlier Constantine and which now stood ready to become the dwelling-place of his namesake. That the tyrant reigned in the lesser Rome of Gaul* was news that might well strike fear in the greater Rome of Italy and even within the impregnable ramparts and waters of Ravenna. To Constantine himself the possession of this great city seemed the outward sign of the completion of his hopes. Secure, as he deemed himself, on the throne at least of all the Gauls, he began to take steps for founding a dynasty, a dynasty which might call up again the memory of the Imperial house whose greatest name he bore. He had two sons, both bearing Flavian names, Constans and Julian, the former of whom is said to have been a professed monk. But, when the aggrandizement of his family was concerned, Constantine had slight

* "Gallula Roma Arelas." O. N. U., Ausonius.

regard to ecclesiastical scruples. Constans was called from his monastery to receive the rank of Cæsar, and to take an active part in government and warfare. His younger brother at the same time received the title of *Nobilissimus* *.

We are without exact dates; but the news of the landing of Constantine in Gaul, the news of the occupation of Trier and of Arles, could not have been very long in reaching Italy. We are not told whether the beginnings of revolt in Britain, the rise and fall of Marcus and of Gratian, had ever been heard of at Rome or Ravenna; at any rate they are not recorded as having led to any action on the part of the central power. It was otherwise when the successive messages came that Constantine had landed in Gaul and that he was playing the part of Emperor in city after city, and again that he had passed through the whole land and had set up his throne at Arelate †. When the first message came,

* Olympiodôros as cited; *οὗτος δύο παῖδας ἔσχε Κώνσταντα καὶ Ἰουλιανὸν, ὧν τὸν μὲν Κώνσταντα καίσαρα χειροτονεῖ, εἶτα ὕστερον κατὰ τὰς αὐτὰς ἡμέρας καὶ τὸν Ἰουλιανὸν νωβελίσσιμον.* So Zôsimos (vi. 4), who calls Constans *πρεσβύτερος τῶν παίδων*, but does not mention Julian by name. The monastic profession of Constans comes from Orosius; "Constantem filium suum, proh dolor, ex monacho Cæsarem factum." The collection of Flavian names in the family of this private soldier is certainly remarkable. Most likely they were popular in Britain. Gregory of Tours (ii. 9) calls Constans Constantius; not so his authorities.

† So far as it is safe to make any inferences from such a confused tale as that of Zôsimos, I seem to see two messages. One (v. 27) comes when Honorius is at Rome and Stilicho at Ravenna—*ἐδηλοῦτο ὡς Κωνσταντῖνος ἐπιθέμενος εἴη τῇ τυραννίδι καὶ ἐκ τῆς Βρεττανικῆς νήσου περαιωθεὶς ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ τὰς Ἄλπεις ἔθνεσι παραγένοιτο, τὰ βασιλέως*

Honorius, Emperor and Consul, was at an unusual place, namely in Rome itself. Stilicho was at Ravenna. At that moment the friend of Alaric, he was, we are told, making ready for an expedition beyond Hadria, to be carried on in fellowship with the Gothic king, an expedition the object of which was to transfer the cities of Illyricum from the obedience of Arcadius to that of Honorius. His schemes were thwarted by two rumours, by a false report of the death of Alaric and by the true report of the advance of Constantine. This last news was announced to Stilicho by letters from Honorius himself*. It was not often, one would think, that the Augustus had news to tell to the Consular, news at least of a graver kind than the revolutions of the poultry-yard. Stilicho now gave up the thought of an Illyrian campaign, and hastened to consult—so we are told—his sovereign as to what was to be done. When Gaul had been attacked by a vast alliance of barbarians, nothing had been done beyond the issuing of proclamations in the province itself.

ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι πράττων. This seems to be still in 407. Then, under the next consuls (see v. 28), come deliberations of Honorius and Stilicho (v. 31) at Bologna, in which one consideration is, *ἤδη Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ τυράννου τὴν Γαλατίαν πᾶσαν διαδραμόντος καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀρελάτῳ διατρίβοντος.* These, in any writer who at all regarded order, would imply two stages.

* Zôsimos, v. 27. Stilicho is making ready at Ravenna; but *δύο κωλύματα συνέβη παρεμπεσεῖν, φήμη τε ὡς Ἀλάριχος τεθνεὼς εἴη διαδραμοῦσα καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης Ὀνωρίου γράμματα τοῦ βασιλέως ἀναδοθέντα.* These contained the first piece of news in the last note, p. 57. The report about Alaric was doubtful, and was soon known to be false; *τὰ δὲ περὶ τῆς ἀναρρήσεως Κωνσταντίνου λεγόμενα παρὰ πᾶσιν ἐκράτει.* Ranke, iv. 1. 232.

But the rise of a rival Emperor was a more serious matter. The deliberations of Stilicho and Honorius seem to have been carried on into the next year (408), the year of the consulship of Bassus and Philip, the year which saw the death of Arcadius at Constantinople, the year in which Honorius—if we can give Honorius the praise or blame of any deed good or bad—used, in the phrase of the next generation, his left hand to cut off his right, by the slaughter of Stilicho himself *. But at the beginning of the year Stilicho is still in favour and Honorius contracts the second of his strange marriages with the daughters of the great Vandal †. Disputes with Alaric, now known to be alive, follow; he is ready for warfare in the East, for which Stilicho, with Constantine in Gaul, no longer designs him. With the tyrant at Arles, his counsel now was to send no less a champion than Alaric himself, in the character of a Roman general, to win back the lost provinces for their lawful prince. He himself, Stilicho, will undertake the affairs of the East, while the West-Gothic king represents the true majesty of Rome beyond the Alps ‡.

A day was to come before long when a West-Gothic king was to go on such an errand, but the

* The saying of the barbarian to the last Valentinian after the murder of Aetius (Procop. Bell. Vand. i. 4); *ὅτι αὐτοῦ τὴν δεξιὰν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ χειρὶ ἀποτεμὼν εἴη.*

† Zôsimos, v. 28.

‡ Zôsimos, v. 31. Stilicho determines *γνώμην τὴν ἀρίστην εἶναι καὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ λυσιτελοῦσαν, Ἀλάριχον μὲν ἐπιστρατεῦσαι τῷ τυράννῳ, τῶν τε σὺν αὐτῷ βαρβάρων ἄγοντα μέρος καὶ τέλη Ῥωμαϊκὰ καὶ ἡγεμόνας, οἱ κοινήσουσιν αὐτῷ τοῦ πολέμου, τὴν ἑῴαν δὲ αὐτὸς καταλήψεσθαι βασιλέως κελεύοντος καὶ γράμματα περὶ τοῦ πρακτέου διδόντος.*

work for which Alaric was destined was of another kind. Yet another Goth was sent this very year to do the work of Honorius against Constantine. It is hard, though we are chiefly following one authority, to put the facts together out of a most confused narrative. We hear of the growing influence of Olympius at the court of Honorius, an influence used to bring about the downfall of Stilicho. We hear of Honorius at Ticinum, while Stilicho is at Bologna. We get a picture of the Emperor haranguing the troops who are to march, under whose command we are not told, against the tyrant at Arelate. A mutiny breaks forth, a mutiny which, it is implied, is in some way connected with the intrigues of Olympius against Stilicho. And it is most significant, though we cannot fully understand the significance, that the outbreak of the soldiers led to the slaughter of the two officers, Limenius and Chariobaudes, who had fled before Constantine to Honorius, and who must have joined him quite lately*. They were already in the

* See above, p. 50, note. Honorius is under the influence of Olympius. Then (v. 32), says Zôsimos, *μετακληθέντων εἰς τὰ βασίλεια τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐφαίνετό τε αὐτοῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ εἰς τὸν κατὰ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ τυράννου παρεθάρσυνε πόλεμον.* Then come the mysterious words, *περὶ δὲ Στελίχωνος οὐδενὸς κινηθέντος ἐφαίνετο νεύων τοῖς στρατιώταις Ὀλύμπιος καὶ ὥσπερ ἀναμιμνήσκων ὧν ἔτυχεν αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβύστῳ διαλεχθείς.* Then comes the slaughter of Limenius and Chariobaudes, and of [Vincentius 'magister equitum' and Salvius, *ὁ δὲ δομεστίκων τάγματος προεστώς*, and] some others. They would thus seem to have been in the interest of Stilicho. As Honorius had been only four days at Ticinum, they could have only just joined him there; but they need not have come straight from Trier, Arles, or whatever part of Gaul they started from.

interest of Stilicho, and on their fate presently follows the fate of Stilicho himself. Yet we read elsewhere that it was at Stilicho's bidding that Sarus, the valiant Goth whose name we so often meet in the history of these times, was sent with a force into Gaul to bring back the land into the obedience of Honorius *. The campaign of Sarus is undoubted; but we have no means of fixing the relations between his campaign and the force that he held and the contemplated march of the troops that broke out into mutiny at Ticinum.

Anyhow the newly-built-up throne of Constantine was threatened. Are we to suppose that, after embarking on so hazardous an enterprise, he shrank from personal danger, or that he was conscious of a lack of military skill? Some accounts represent him, at a later time at least, as more active at the table than in the camp †. Certain it is that it was not Constantine in person who met the army of Sarus in battle. While the barbarians were marching and harrying throughout the land without let or hindrance, two Roman armies met, both doubtless largely made up of barbarian soldiers. The cause of Constantine was defended by his lieutenant Justinian; but the fortune of war was on the side of legitimacy. Sarus gained a victory which carried with it the

* Sarus has been already mentioned by Zôsimos, v. 30; but our account of this campaign comes wholly from vi. 2; *κατὰ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους Σάρον τὸν στρατηγὸν ἐκπέμπει μετὰ στρατεύματος κατὰ Κωνσταντίνου Στελίχων.*

† "Constantinus gulæ et ventri deditus," says Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus in Greg. Tur. ii. 9.

death of Justinian and of the greater part of his army, and the winning of great spoil by the army of Honorius *. Of the details of the fight, of the place, of the exact time, we hear nothing; but it is clear that it was fought somewhere in the lower Rhone-land, and it would seem that the routed army could have been only a small part of the forces of Constantine. Where he himself was at the moment we are not told; we know only that, after the battle, he deemed it wise to secure himself in one of the strong cities of the land, but in one which lies a good way to the north of his newly chosen capital. Many of those cities are greater in old renown, many are richer in abiding remains of Imperial power, but none holds a stronger site; none looks more proudly from its height on the great river at its feet, than the city in which Constantine sought shelter against the attack of Sarus. The walls of the Gaulish Valentia do not still stand in witness of those days like the walls of Arelate and the true Vienna; but in those days the city of the Sagellauni was one of the great fortresses of the land. Its name might suggest the thought of the great prince who had bestowed that name on the recovered regions of the island that Constantine had forsaken. But while the Valentia of Britain did indeed preserve the name of Valentinian, the Valentia of Gaul was of older date; it bore the name of Rome herself, and the Valentia by the Rhone might pass as not only the colony but the

* Zôsimos, vi. 2; ὁ δὲ [Σάρος] Ἰουστινιανῷ τῷ στρατηγῷ μετὰ τῆς δυναμέως τῆς σὺν αὐτῷ ἀπαντήσας αὐτόν τε ἀναιρεῖ καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τὴν πλείονα μοῖραν, καὶ λείας πολλῆς γενόμενος κύριος.

namesake of the Valentia by the Tiber. There Constantine took his stand. Sarus followed him and laid siege to the strong hill-city. But the Goth went on to sully his hitherto honourable successes by a deed of foul treachery. One of Constantine's generals, the Roman Justinian, had fallen in battle; the other, the Frankish Nebiogast, now made friendly advances to Sarus; oaths were exchanged; but oaths went for little with Sarus, and Nebiogast was presently put to death*. And now, after these successes, the whole enterprise of which Sarus was the head breaks down in a strange way, which we should be well pleased to have explained to us at greater length. The murder of Nebiogast must have happened while Sarus was before Valence, which was no great length of time. To replace his lost generals, Constantine appointed two men whose military reputation would seem to have been higher than theirs. Another Frank, Edeobich or Edobich by name, and Gerontius, who had come from Britain, and in whom we can hardly fail to see a name-father of more than one British Gerent, were put at the head of the forces of Constantine. Sarus, we are told, was so fearful of their skill and experience in war that he raised the siege of Valence on the seventh day †.

* Ib. *ἐπειδὴ Κωνσταντῖνον αὐτὸν ἔγνω πόλιν καταλαβόντα Βαλεντίαν, ἀρκοῦσαν αὐτῷ πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν, εἰς πολιορκίαν κατέστησε. Νεβιογάστου δὲ τοῦ λειπομένου στρατηγοῦ λόγους τῷ Σάρῳ περὶ φιλίας προσάγοντος ἐδέχετο μὲν ὡς φίλον τὸν ἄνδρα, δοὺς δὲ καὶ λαβὼν ὅρκους ἀναιρεῖ παραχρῆμα, μηδένα τῶν ὅρκων ποιησάμενος λόγον.*

† Ib. *Κωνσταντίνου δὲ στρατηγὸν καταστήσαντος Ἐδεόβιγχον Φράγκον ὄντα τὸ γένος, Γερόντιον δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Βρεττανίας ὁρμώμενον, δείσας ὁ Σάρος*

His object was now to get back into Italy; the generals of Constantine overtook him with a great force and brought him to great straits. But the words of our story would seem to imply that this was rather by harassing his march than by an actual battle. He escaped into Italy with great difficulty, and that only by help which we should hardly have looked for. Alongside of the new scourges of Gaul, barbarian invasion and civil war, a far older scourge had either lived on or had shown itself again. The Bagaudæ, the *Jacquerie* of more than a hundred years earlier, were still in force, at any rate on the Gaulish slopes of the Alps. They met Sarus, with what objects we are not told, but we are given to understand that his passage into Italy was made secure by a timely gift to the Bagaudæ of the spoil which he had won in his victory over Justinian *. Nothing can be more unsatisfactory than this kind of

τὴν τῶν στρατηγῶν τούτων περὶ τὰ πολέμια πεῖραν ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀνδρίαν ἀνεχώρησε τῆς Βαλεντίας, *ἑπτὰ πολιορκήσας αὐτὴν ἡμέρας.* The British Gerent is of course merely a form of Gerontios; but it has become a specially British name, and it is worthy of notice that we see it so early.

* Zôsimos, vi. 2; *καταδραμόντων δὲ αὐτὸν τῶν* Κωνσταντίνου *στρατηγῶν μετὰ μεγίστης δυναστείας, σὺν πολλῷ διεσώθη πόνῳ, τὴν λείαν ἅπασαν δωρησάμενος τοῖς περὶ τὰς* Ἄλπεις *ἀπαντήσασιν αὐτῷ* Βακαύδαις, *ὅπως εὐρυχωρίας παρ' αὐτῶν τύχῃ τῆς ἐπὶ τὴν* Ἰταλίαν *παρόδου.* Καταδραμόντων would seem to imply skirmishes rather than a regular battle; *δυναστεία* is a singular word for a military force, and there is something strange in this quite taking for granted of the Bagaudæ. He does not mention them elsewhere, and his bringing them in in this way might almost suggest that there is something in the view of Dubos (i. 205, cf. Gibbon, v. 223, ed. Milman) that the Bagaudæ were, now at least, something of a local militia rather than mere freebooters. See Ducange in voc. [See my Hist. Essays, Series iv. p. 118.]

story. We put up with the mere annalist, who records victory and defeat without attempting to explain their causes; but here we are told just enough to awaken our curiosity without satisfying it. But in any case the enterprise of Sarus altogether broke down; he had slain in war and by treason two generals of Constantine; but their death seems only to have led to the advancement of more competent successors. Whatever might become of Britain and Italy, the tyrant from the island was now the only representative of Roman dominion in Gaul. His power was at all events firmly established in his own south-eastern corner, which Vandals, Suevians, and Alans, on their march from the Belgian lands to the Pyrenees, would be likely to leave untouched *. And as if Gaul were a separate realm and Italy a hostile land, he strengthened himself against a second invasion from beyond the Alps, by placing garrisons in their three chief passes, Cottian, Pennine, and Maritime †.

* Olympiodôros, u. s.; *κρατεῖ πάντων τῶν μερῶν τῆς Γαλατίας μέχρι τῶν Ἄλπεων τῶν μεταξὺ Ἰταλίας τε καὶ Γαλατίας.* Zôsimos (vi. 2), in a passage part of which has already been quoted, seems to copy the definition; *πάντα τε οἰκειωσάμενος τὰ στρατεύματα μέχρι τῶν Ἄλπεων ὄντα τῶν ὁριζουσῶν Γαλατίαν καὶ Ἰταλίαν, ἀσφαλῶς ἔχεσθαι τῆς βασιλείας ἐδόκει.* The distinction is perhaps needful, as Orosius talks of "Pyrenæi Alpes."

† Ib.; *Σάρου τοίνυν οὕτως εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν διασωθέντος συναγαγὼν ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος τὴν δύναμιν ἅπασαν ἔγνω φυλακὰς ἀρκούσας ἐγκαταστῆσαι ταῖς Ἄλπεσιν. ἦσαν δὲ αὗται τρεῖς, αἱ τὰς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἀπὸ Κελτῶν κἀκεῖθεν ἐπέκεινα τὰς ὁδοὺς ἀποκλείουσαι, Κοττίαι Ποιννίαι Μαριτίμαι.*

Sôzomen too (ix. 11) brings in the Cottian Alps, though he makes no mention of the expedition of Sarus. His summary of events

Constantine was now undisputed master of Gaul, at least of the remnant of Gaul that clave to Rome. Britain he had left behind him. If he aspired to the dominion of Italy, he prudently put off any attempts on that side, till he had made himself master of all the provinces beyond the Alps. He was bound, for his own ends, to extend his dominion from Gaul in the geographical sense, to Gaul in the widest official meaning of the word, and to complete his possession of the Gaulish prefecture by the acquisition of Spain. The great peninsula of the west was one of the most flourishing parts of the Roman dominion, and the one which had suffered least from barbarian invasion. Since the Teutonic harryings in the days of Gallienus Spain had been untouched by strangers, free from any oppression save what it may have suffered at their hands who represented the power of Rome within its borders *. The legions that were regularly

runs; Περαιωθεὶς δὲ Κωνσταντεῖνος ἀπὸ Βρεττανίας ἐπὶ Βονωνίαν πόλιν τῆς Γαλατίας περὶ θάλασσαν κειμένην, προσηγάγετο τοὺς παρὰ Γαλάταις καὶ Ἀκουιτανοῖς, στρατιώτας· καὶ τοὺς τῇδε ὑπηκόους περιεποίησεν ἑαυτῷ, μέχρι τῶν μεταξὺ Ἰταλίας καὶ Γαλατίας ὅρων, ἃς Κοττίας Ἄλπεις Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσι. Κώνσταντα δὲ τὸν πρεσβύτερον τῶν αὐτοῦ υἱέων, ὃν ὕστερον βασιλέως σχῆμα ἐνέδυσε, Καίσαρα τότε ἀναγορεύσας, πέπομφεν εἰς Σπανίαν. His whole story seems to come from the same source as that of Zôsimos, though there are odd differences. The use of Ῥωμαῖοι, as in Procopius and long after in Constantine Porphyrogenitos, shows the difficulties sometimes felt by those who were Romans by political allegiance but not Latins in speech.

* This seems implied in the emphatic though somewhat involved words of Orosius; "Irruptæ sunt Hispaniæ; cædes vastationesque passæ sunt: nihil quidem novum. Hoc enim nunc per biennium, illud quo hostilis gladius sævit sustinere a barbaris quod per CC quondam annos passæ fuerant a Romanis, quod etiam sub

quartered in Spain, and which were doubtless largely made up of natives of Spain, claimed the defence of the land as their special work, and resented any intrusion of strangers as a breach of their local privileges*. But the land had commonly been passive in revolutions, and had readily accepted such rulers as bore sway on the other side of the Pyrenees†. But at this particular moment, an element had to be reckoned with in Spain which would hardly have passed for a political influence in any other province. Spain had given the world a dynasty. Theodosius, like Trajan before him, had come forth to rule the Empire from the most western of its provinces, and to rule it, like his great countryman, so as to leave a memorable name behind him. The sons of Theodosius, princes of Spanish descent, still ruled, or at least reigned, at Constantinople and at Ravenna. The kinsfolk of the Imperial house, though not marked out from other men by titles or offices known to the Empire at large, were men of wealth

imperatore Gallieno per annos propemodum XII Germanis evertentibus exceperunt."

* So witnesses Zôsimos (vi. 5) a little later; *τῶν ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ στρατοπέδων ἐμπιστευθῆναι κατὰ τὸ σύνηθες τὴν φυλακὴν αἰτησάντων, καὶ μὴ ξένοις ἐπιτραπῆναι τὴν τῆς χώρας ἀσφάλειαν.*

† Such is the remark of Gibbon (v. 223, ed. Milman); "His throne was soon established by the conquest, or rather submission of Spain; which yielded to the influence of regular and habitual subordination, and received the laws and magistrates." He adds; "The only opposition which was made to the authority of Constantine proceeded not so much from the powers of government, or the spirit of the people, as from the private zeal and interest of the family of Theodosius."

and influence in their own land, attached to the throne of their Imperial kinsmen and acknowledged by those kinsmen as men bound to them by the ties of blood. To the mass of the people of Spain it might seem most natural that Spain and Gaul should go together; to the members of the Theodosian house and to all who shared their feelings the first object of all was that the land of Theodosius should abide in the allegiance of the sons of Theodosius. Constantine had therefore to look, not so much for any general resistance in arms on the part of the province or its regular defenders, as for whatever amount of opposition in any shape could be stirred up by a few powerful men. But that opposition was likely to be of a very dangerous kind. Constantine is described as fearing a joint attack from two branches of the Theodosian family, from the Emperor in Italy by the way of the Alps and from his kinsmen in Spain by way of the Pyrenees. Lest his dominion should fall when thus assaulted on both sides, Constantine determined to forestall all attacks from the Spanish side, and at once to begin the occupation of the peninsula *. The date is not hard to fix. We are still in the year 408, the year of the campaign of Sarus and of the death of Stilicho. That year saw also the death of Arcadius and the beginning of the

* Zôsimos, vi. 4; *τῶν αὐτόθι [ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ] πάντων ἐθνῶν ἐγκρατὴς γενέσθαι βουλόμενος, ὥστε καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐξῆσαι καὶ ἅμα τὴν τῶν Ὀνωρίου συγγενῶν αὐτόθι δυναστείαν ἐκκόψαι. δέος γὰρ αὐτὸν εἰσήει μή ποτε δύναμιν συναγαγόντες τῶν αὐτόθι στρατιωτῶν αὐτοὶ μὲν αὐτῷ διαβάντες τὴν Πυρήνην ἐπέλθοιεν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Ἰταλίας ὁ βασιλεὺς Ὀνώριος ἐπιπέμψας αὐτῷ τὰ στρατόπεδα τῆς τυραννίδος, κύκλῳ πανταχόθεν περιλαβὼν, παραλύσειεν.*

long reign of the younger Theodosius*. It saw also the operations of the forces of Constantine in Spain. Those operations, it has been truly remarked, imply some kind of treaty or understanding with the barbarians who, it must never be forgotten, were still ranging through Gaul at pleasure†. The relations between him and them, the way in which each side seems to act with no seeming hindrance on the part of the other, form one of the great puzzles of our story. Some of the vain agreements with the invaders of Gaul, so darkly hinted at by a contemporary‡, must surely have taken place at this stage.

It would almost seem that for a while (408) the peninsula submitted without any opposition to the ruler of Gaul and to the officers whom he sent to represent him§. But if so, this submission was only for a

* Theodosius was now in the sixth year of his reign as his father's colleague. Born in 401, he became Augustus in 402; he took his first consulship in 403, and kept his *quinquennalia* in 407. See Sôzomen, viii. 4, and the Fasti. He was as much Emperor before as he was now, only the style now was "Honorius et Theodosius Augg." instead of "Arcadius, Honorius, et Theodosius."

† Wietersheim, ii. 161; "Auch muss zu Beginn dieses Jahres eine Art von friedlichen Verträgnisse zwischen ihm [Constantin] und die Eingedrungenen Barbaren bestanden haben, so dass er ohne Gefahr eines jeden Angriffs durch dieselben an Ausdehnung seiner Herrschaf auf Spanien denken konnte."

‡ See above, p. 52, and note.

§ Orosius, u. s.; "Misit in Hispanias *judices*, quos cum provinciæ obedienter accepissent, duo fratres . . . tueri sese patriamque moliti sunt." After this comes the mission of Constans. From the other writers one would think that Constans was sent as the first step on the part of his father towards action in Spain. It seems

moment. Among the kinsmen of Honorius, four brothers, bearing the names of Didymus, Verenianus, Theodosius or Theodosiolus, and Lagodius—we may mark a certain tendency to Greek names in the Theodosian house—held a high position for birth and wealth in different parts of Spain*. Two of them, Didymus and Verenianus, now raised the standard of legitimacy, the standard of their own house. The other two seem to have taken no part in the enterprise†. Didymus and his brother, we are pointedly

more likely that they should have left out an earlier mission than that Orosius should have imagined two missions when there was only one.

* Theodosius, Theodosiolus, Didymus, Lagodius, Arcadius. On the other hand there is Honorius. Galla Placidia is called after her mother, the daughter of Valentinian. Sôzomen (ix. 12) speaks of Theodosiolus and Lagodius *ἐν ἑτέραις ἐπαρχίαις διατρίβοντες*, while the other brothers carried on the war.

† The accounts here are somewhat hard to bring into agreement in detail. The clearest account is that of Sôzomen (ix. 11, 12), who does not put the events in exactly the same order as Zôsimos (vi. 4). Orosius moralizes more, but goes less into detail; from Olympiodôros we unluckily hear nothing again till a later stage. After the passage quoted above, Sôzomen goes on; *ὁ δὲ* [Κώνστας] *τὸ ἔθνος καταλαβὼν, ἄρχοντας ἰδίους κατέστησε. καὶ δεσμίους αὐτῷ ἀχθῆναι προσέταξε Δίδυμον καὶ Βερενιανὸν, τοὺς 'Ονωρίου συγγενεῖς· οἳ τὰ πρῶτα διαφερόμενοι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, εἰς κίνδυνον καταστήσαντες ὡμονόησαν, καὶ πλῆθος ἀγροίκων καὶ οἰκετῶν συλλέξαντες, κοινῇ κατὰ τὴν Λυσιτανίαν παρετάξαντο, καὶ πολλοὺς ἀνεῖλον τῶν εἰς σύλληψιν αὐτῶν ἀποσταλέντων ἀπὸ τοῦ τυράννου στρατιωτῶν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συμμαχίας προστιθείσης τοῖς ἐναντίοις, ἐζωγρήθησαν, καὶ ἅμα ταῖς αὐτῶν γαμεταῖς ἀπήχθησαν καὶ ὕστερον ἀνηρέθησαν.*

The version of Zôsimos runs thus; *ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Κώνστας εἰς τὴν 'Ιβηρίαν διέβη . . . τῶν δὲ ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τάξεων ἄρχοντάς τε πολιτικοὺς ἅμα καὶ στρατιωτικοὺς καταστήσας, ἄγει διὰ τούτων ἐπ' ἐκείνους οἳ γένει τῷ*

told, did not themselves assume the tyranny in opposition to the tyrant; so to do, it seems to be implied,

βασιλεῖ Θεοδωσίῳ προσήκοντες τὰ τῆς Ἰβηρίας συνεταράττοντο πράγματα, πρότερον μὲν πρὸς αὐτὸν Κώνσταντα διὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ Λυσιτανίᾳ στρατοπέδων ἀράμενοι πόλεμον, ἐπεὶ δὲ πλεονεκτεῖσθαι συνήσθοντο, πλῆθος οἰκετῶν καὶ γεωργῶν ἐπιστρατεύσαντες καὶ παρὰ βραχεῖ καταστήσαντες αὐτὸν εἰς μέγιστον κίνδυνον. ἀλλὰ κἀνταῦθα τῆς ἐλπίδος διαμαρτόντες Κώνσταντι σὺν ταῖς σφῶν γυναιξὶν ἦσαν ἐν φυλακῇ.

Orosius goes on from the place already quoted; "Fratres juvenes nobiles et locupletes Didymus et Verenianus . . . plurimo tempore servulos tantum suos ex propriis præsidiis colligentes ac vernacula alentes sumptibus, nec dissimulato proposito absque cujusque inquietudine ad Pyrenæi claustra tendebant. Adversus hos Constantinus Constantem filium suum, proh dolor, ex monacho Cæsarem factum, cum barbaris quibusdam qui quondam in fœdus recepti atque in militiam allecti Honoriani vocabantur, in Hispanias misit. Hic apud Hispanias prima mali labes. Nam interfectis illis fratribus qui tutari privato præsidio Pyrenæi alpes moliebantur," &c.

Here is first the difference already pointed out that Orosius makes the brothers rise against officers already sent by Constantine, and makes Constans come against them, while in the other two versions the brothers seem at least not to rise till after the coming of Constans, though, in the way that both Sôzomen and Zôsimos tell the story, the chronological order is not strictly observed, and their words might be understood of an earlier rising. This so far confirms the version of Orosius, though the "judices" whom he makes Constantine send first of all before Constans must surely be the same as the *ἄρχοντες* set up by Constans in Sôzomen. The *ἄρχοντες* in Zôsimos are in a marked way connected with the *ἐν αὐλῇ τάξεις*, who seem to be the same as the *Honoriani* in Orosius.

Then, whenever the movement of Didymus and Verenianus took place, our authorities seem hopelessly at variance as to its geography. Orosius makes them collect an army of slaves and peasants and occupy the Pyrenæan frontier before Constans comes. Both Zôsimos and Sôzomen make Lusitania the first seat of war;

would have been the most natural course for men in their position; they strove for their country and for

only Zôsimos makes the brothers begin their enterprise with such regular troops as were quartered in Lusitania; when these are defeated, they gather an army of peasants and slaves, who for a while bring Constans to great straits, but who are afterwards defeated. In Sôzomen the brothers, after making up some differences between themselves which are unexplained and of which we hear nothing elsewhere, appear in Lusitania at the head of their irregular army, and seem for a while to be successful in a guerrilla warfare. Then new forces come to the help of Constans, and they are defeated. One may suspect that this last is another version of the coming of Constans himself, and the word *συμμαχία* suggests the Honorians. In any case, we have, as in Orosius, two sendings of forces to Spain on the part of Constantine.

The "rustic army of the Theodosian family," as Gibbon calls it, appears in all the versions. It is the one thing about which all the accounts agree, and we therefore accept it as the one thing about which we may be really certain. But our accounts do not agree as to its sphere of action; or rather Orosius gives us a clear and probable version, while Sôzomen and Zôsimos are quite vague. In Orosius they occupy, or at any rate set out to occupy, the passes of the Pyrenees ("tendebant," "moliebantur," imply rather an attempt than an actual occupation). Yet we can hardly get rid of the mention of Lusitania, a land which is mentioned by both Zôsimos and Sôzomen, though they differ as to what happened there. I think, on the whole, that we may infer,

First, That Constantine sent agents or troops into Spain twice, the second time under the command of his son Constans. This is distinctly asserted by Orosius and is partly confirmed by Sôzomen.

Secondly, That the movement of the brothers was a rising against the first occupation, and that Constans was sent to put down their rising. This again is distinctly asserted by Orosius, and several expressions in the other two writers (though they tell another story) help to confirm it.

Thirdly, That the rustic army is the most authentic part of the story, as being asserted by all three writers, and that its main

their lawful prince at once against the tyrant and against the barbarians who followed him *. But if

action was directed, seemingly unsuccessfully, towards guarding the Pyrenees. This is distinctly asserted by Orosius, and it is consistent with the language of the other two.

Fourthly, That something happened in Lusitania before the march of the rustic army towards the Pyrenees. This is the hardest part of the story. Orosius says nothing about Lusitania. In Sôzomen the action there is successful action of the rustic army. In Zôsimos it is unsuccessful action of regular troops before the rustic army is got together. He makes the rustics fight better than the regulars, which, though unexpected, is quite possible. In the other stories there are no regulars on the side of the brothers. Yet one cannot help thinking that the twofold action of the rustics in Sôzomen, first in Lusitania, then somewhere else, is the same as the action in Zôsimos, first of the regulars in Lusitania, then of the rustics somewhere else. Zôsimos can hardly have imagined his regulars; so that so far his account has the preference to Sôzomen. Only Sôzomen represents the first action, whether of rustics or regulars, as successful, Zôsimos as unsuccessful. In this kind of warfare, there might be many alternations of success, but the gathering of a second army slightly favours the version of Zôsimos.

On the whole the probabilities of the case would seem to be met by such an account as I have given in the text.

* So Orosius; "Non assumpserunt adversus tyrannum quidem tyrannidem, sed imperatori justo adversus tyrannum *et barbaros* tueri sese patriamque suam moliti sunt." He goes on; "Quod ipso gestæ rei ordine patuit. Nam tyrannidem nemo nisi celeriter maturatam secreto invadit, et publicæ arma cujus summa est assumpto diademate ac purpura videri ante quam sciri."

It would seem to be from the phrase "tyrannum et barbaros," where "barbaros" surely means the Honorians, that Isidore of Seville (who seems to be followed by Fauriel, i. 51) developed the picture which is given at the beginning of the "Historia Wandalorum" of Didymus and Verenianus defending the passes of the Pyrenees against the Alans, Suevians, and Vandals during

two of the four brothers were united as to ends, they were not at first of one mind as to means. It was

the whole time of their sojourn in Gaul. His story is made out of Orosius in a curious way. He first copies the passage quoted above with some noteworthy changes. He leaves out the "multæque cum his aliæ gentes" of Orosius, doubtless because Vandals, Alans, and Suevians were the only nations whom he could see in the later history of Spain. Then he changes the order of the words of Orosius, "Francos proterunt, Rhenum transeunt, Gallias invadunt" into "transito Rheno, Gallias irruunt, Francos proterunt," because he was most used to Franks in Gaul, and hardly understood the process of getting into Gaul by fighting Franks on the other side of the Rhine. Then, whereas Orosius surely means simply that they reached the Pyrenees without hindrance either from man or nature, and then shrank for a while from attempting anything so strange as the mountain passes, Isidore has the passes ready guarded by the kinsmen of Honorius. It is possible that they may have commanded the native forces in Spain; but there is no reason to think that they did, as this piece of Isidore is full of confusion. He goes on; "cujus [Pyrenæi] obice per Didymum et Verenianum nobilissimos et potentissimos fratres ab Spania tribus annis repulsi per circumjacentes Galliæ provincias vagabantur. Sed postquam iidem fratres, qui privato præsidio Pyrenæi claustra tuebantur ob suspicionem tyrannidis insontes et nulla culpa noxii a Constantio Cæsare interfecti sunt, memoratæ gentes Spanianas provincias irrumpunt." But it was against Constans, not against Vandals and Alans, that the brothers gathered their "privatum præsidium," and Isidore seems to have jumbled together Constantine, Constans, and Constantius.

This version of Orosius has been followed by Fauriel, i. 51, where Didymus and "Valerian" appear at a very early stage of the story as guarding the Pyrenæan passes at the head of the Pyrenæan mountaineers, and with them driving back the barbarians. All this seems to come out of Orosius' phrase of the "obex," as improved by Isidore. The "barbari" of Orosius' narrative whom Didymus and Verenian oppose are surely the Honorians of Constantine. The Vandals, Suevians, and Alans are

only after some unexplained differences among themselves that Didymus and Verenianus agreed on any combined action. The general course of events is clear; but it is not easy to put together our various short notices into a connected story. It would seem that Lusitania was the part of Spain in which the brothers had most influence, and that in which they first took up arms. One account reads as if a regular legion quartered on that side of the country joined the cause which they supported. It was seemingly at this stage that the Cæsar Constans was sent from Gaul by his father to put down the revolt and to bring its leaders before him in bonds *. He came at the head of the barbarian allies whom his father had found in Gaul. They bore the name of Honorians, but they were enlisted on behalf of Constantine against the prince whose name they bore. A motley gathering of troops of various nations, Scots, Moors, and Germans, they ranked among the household troops of the Empire, but they were likely to be indifferent as to which of two rival Augusti they drew their swords to support †. Constans took with

not seen in Orosius' narrative between the words "His per Gallias bacchantibus" and the words "Perdita Pyrenæi custodia claustrisque patefactis."

* Sôzomen, ix. 11; ὁ δὲ [Κώνστας] τὸ ἔθνος παραλαβὼν, ἄρχοντας ἰδίους κατέθηκε καὶ δεσμίους αὐτῷ ἀχθῆναι προσέταξε Δίδυμον καὶ Βερενιανὸν, τοὺς Ὀνωρίου συγγενεῖς. Surely this sounds more like orders given by Constantine to his son on his setting out from Gaul.

† The passages in the Notitia (§ 38) about these Honoriaci—Honoriani, as in the record, is doubtless the more correct form—are discussed by Gibbon, ch. xxx. note 99 (v. 224); Wietersheim, ii. 162; Hodgkin, i. 743, n. The name shows that they could not be

him the British general Gerontius, and he took with him also as a civil lieutenant a man chiefly memorable as the forefather of one of his own descendants. Apollinaris, grandfather of the famous Sidonius of Auvergne, came of a senatorial house which ranked high among the nobility of his own province and of all Gaul. The highest office in the Western lands, the prætorian præfecture of the Gauls, was almost hereditary in his house. But he was the first of his line, as his admiring grandson tells us, to embrace the new creed of the Empire and to have the cross signed upon his brow *. He did not scruple to accept

regiments of very long standing: says Wietersheim. Gibbon must have been smiling when he suggested that the Scots were "influenced by any partial affection for a British prince." Wietersheim lays the seat of war on the west coast, and supposes that the march of Constans was made in connexion with a landing by sea, which is not mentioned in our authorities. [Mr. Hodgkin believes that the "Honorians" did not form "one division of the army," nor "ever necessarily acted together."]

* Zôsimos, vi. 4; στρατηγὸν μὲν Τερέντιον ἔχων, Ἀπολλινάριον δὲ τῆς αὐλῆς ὕπαρχον. For *Terentius*, who does not appear in any other part of the story, I venture to read *Gerontius*.

Sidonius speaks of his grandfather, Ep. iii. 12 (iii. 1 Baret) and v. 9 (v. 20 Baret), in the former of which letters he gives his epitaph. Some of the lines run;

"Præfectus jacet hic Apollinaris
Post prætoria recta Galliarum.
Mœrentis patriæ sinu receptus,
Consultissimus utilissimusque
Ruris, militiæ, forique cultor,
Exemploque aliis periculoso
Liber sub dominantibus tyrannis.
Hoc sed maxima dignitas probatur,
Quod frontem cruce, membra fonte, purgans

his office, seemingly as the successor of Limenius, at the hands of the actual ruler of Gaul, and to help that ruler's son in his attempt to add Spain to his father's dominion. The adhesion of such a man to the cause of Constantine is the best witness to the general acquiescence, to say the least, of the Gaulish lands in the transfer of Imperial power to his hands. The joint march of Constans, Gerontius, and Apollinaris was met at some stage, seemingly on the Spanish side of the Pyrenees, by an irregular army of slaves and peasants, a force which Didymus and Verenianus had seemingly kept for some while at their own cost *. Their object was to bar the passes of the Pyrenees against the invaders from Gaul, a work for which Spanish *guerrilla* troops would be excellently fitted in any age. For this it would seem they came too late. Their efforts were indeed not wholly without success; they are vaguely said to have put Constans in great danger †. But in the end they were routed, and their leaders, Didymus and Verenianus, were taken prisoners, with their

Primus de numero patrum suorum
Sacris sacrilegis renuntiavit."

In the other letter he tells us how Apollinaris and his friend Rusticus "in Constantino inconstantiam, in Jovino facilitatem, in Gerontio perfidiam, singula in singulis, omnia in Dardano crimina simul exsecrarentur." He goes on to mention the offices of his father and his friend of the next generation under Honorius and Valentinian the Third, when "unus Galliarum præfuit parti, alter soliditati"—the "soliditas," one would think, only of so much as was left.

* See the passage from Sôzomen quoted in note, p. 66.

† See the passage from Orosius quoted in note, p. 66.

wives. The other brothers, who were in some other part of Spain, took fright at the fate of their kinsmen, and fled, Theodosiolus to Honorius in Italy and Lagôdios to Constantinople *. He could hardly have got thither till the latter part of the year 408, when he found the young Theodosius already the only Emperor in the East.

Constans now, as a Cæsar ruling in Spain, established his court at Cæsaraugusta, the modern Zaragoza, a choice not unconnected with the greater events which we shall presently mention. He had so utterly cast aside his monastic vows that he had taken to him a wife; whether he had brought her with him to Spain or had found her there, we are not told. He was now summoned by his father into Gaul to discuss the affairs of their common Empire. He obeyed; he left his wife in his Cæsarean palace at Zaragoza, and entrusted Gerontius with the command of the Honorian troops and with the defence of Spain. He then hastened to his father, taking with him the captive kinsmen of Honorius, Didymus and Verenianus. They were presently put to death by order of Constantine; of the fate of the wives who shared their captivity we hear nothing †.

* Zôsimos, vi. 4; *ὅπερ ἀκηκοότες οἱ τούτων ἀδελφοὶ Θεοδόσιός τε καὶ Λαγώδιος, ὁ μὲν εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν διέφυγεν, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὴν ἑῴαν διασωθεὶς ἀνεχώρησε.* Sôzomen, ix. 12; *ἐν ἑτέραις δὲ ἐπαρχίαις διατρίβοντες Θεοδοσίωλος καὶ Λαγώδιος οἱ αὐτῶν ἀδελφοὶ φεύγουσι τὴν πατρίδα, καὶ διασώζονται, Θεοδοσίωλος μὲν εἰς Ἰταλίαν πρὸς Ὀνώριον τὸν βασιλέα, Λαγώδιος δὲ πρὸς Θεοδόσιον εἰς ἀνατολήν.* I cannot think, with Gibbon, that these two brothers had any share in the war.

† Orosius at this point tells us nothing of the doings of Con-

Constantine was thus, to all appearance, undisputed ruler of Spain and of so much of Gaul as the Vandals, Suevians, and Alans were not at any particular moment laying waste. In the lands on the Rhone the retreat of Sarus had left him without a rival. But he was at this moment the only representative of Roman power beyond the Alps. His position in the Western world was clearly better than that of the Augustus at Ravenna, threatened every moment by Alaric, and now left without the arm of Stilicho to guard him. That Honorius should outlive both Alaric and Constantine, that he should die an undisputed Emperor, master of so much of the

stantine and Constans. He is carried away from the subject by a torrent, partly of declamation, partly of valuable historical matter, to which we shall have to look presently. From Sôzomen we might almost have fancied that Didymus and Verenianus were put to death in Spain. See the passage, ix. 11, quoted in note, p. 66. He now goes on; Ὁ μὲν Κώνστας ταῦτα διαπραξάμενος, ἐπανῆλθε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, φρουρὰν καταστήσας ἀπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τῆς ἐπὶ τῆς Σπανίας παρόδου. Zôsimos (vi. 5) is clear; Ταῦτα κατὰ τὴν Ἰβηρίαν ὁ Κώνστας διαπραξάμενος ἐπανῆλθε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ Κωνσταντῖνον, ἐπαγόμενος Βερηνιανὸν καὶ Διδύμιον, καταλιπών τε αὐτόθι τὸν στρατηγὸν Γερόντιον, ἅμα τοῖς ἀπὸ Γαλατίας στρατιώταις, φύλακα τῆς ἀπὸ Κελτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰβηρίαν παρόδου . . . Βερηνιανὸς μὲν οὖν καὶ Διδύμιος ὡς Κωνσταντῖνον ἀχθέντες ἀνηρέθησαν παραχρῆμα. These troops from Gaul are clearly the Honorians, of whom, as we shall presently see, Orosius has much to say at this point. We have also got the help of one of the fragments of the otherwise unknown writer—Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus, preserved to us by Gregory of Tours, ii. 9; "Accito Constantinus tyrannus de Hispaniis Constante filio iterumque tyranno, quo de summa rerum consultarent præsentes; quo factum est ut Constans, instrumento aulæ et conjuge sua Cæsaraugustæ dimissis, Gerontio inter Hispanias omnibus creditis ad patrem continuato itinere decurreret."

West as was still left to Rome, and that the power of Rome should be yet restored over no small part of the West from which it seemed to have passed away, is one of the strangest things in the strange times which we are studying.

III.

[CONSTANTINE EMPEROR AND MAXIMUS TYRANT.]

We left Constantine undisputed master, undisputed emperor, within so much of Gaul and Spain as obeyed any Emperor at all. Some parts of those lands were still harried at pleasure by detachments of the great host that had crossed the Rhine on the last day of the year 406. Some parts, it may be, were throwing off the dominion of Rome altogether. Britain, the land from which Constantine had set forth, was, not so much throwing off the dominion of Rome, as slipping away from it without effort on either side. The dominions of Constantine in the West were painfully smaller than the dominions of Valentinian and Theodosius. But within them he had no Roman rival. The master of Italy, far less master in Italy than Constantine was in Gaul, had striven to shake his throne, and he had failed. Throughout the provinces beyond the Alps, the adventurer from Britain, like other adventurers from Britain before him, was "Dominus Noster;" he was Augustus, he was "Pius," "Felix," and "Pater Patriæ." As such his name was graven on inscriptions; his

image and superscription was, in all the Western lands, the image and superscription of Cæsar. What then was lacking to him? Something which it is not easy to define. With all his success, he was still, in the eyes of men of his own time, as he abides in the pages of history, Constantine the Tyrant. In using that name in these ages, just as in using it in the days of the old Greek commonwealths, we must throw aside that modern abuse of it by which it is vaguely applied to any ruler whom it is meant to brand as an oppressor. This abuse is closely allied to the kindred abuse of other technical terms of Greek and Roman politics, which make it dangerous, even in writing Greek or Roman history, to use the original words in their original meaning without some kind of qualification. At least from the days of Herodotus to the days of William of Malmesbury, the word "tyrant" had a definite meaning; and it is wonderful to see how little the meaning of the word in William of Malmesbury has changed from its meaning in Herodotus. The change in the use of the word is simply the change which is implied in a changed state of things. A tyrant is one who takes to himself power without any lawful claim to take it. The name has nothing to do with his use of power when he gets it. Undoubtedly he who gains power wrongfully is under many temptations to use it badly; but his using of it badly is not implied in the mere name of tyrant. The Greek tyrants, as a rule, were oppressors; but even among them the rule was not universal; there is no contradiction in terms in speaking of a just

and merciful tyrant*. The Roman rulers to whom the name was transferred by a happy analogy, hold a higher place; they are average Emperors, good or bad as may happen. The difference between the Greek and the Roman use comes from the different shapes which the tyranny, that is the unlawful assumption of power, took among the Greek commonwealths and under the Roman Empire. The Greek tyrant had overthrown a commonwealth; even if it was an oligarchy and not a free democracy that he had overthrown, even if a large part of the community welcomed him as the destroyer of oligarchy, he had still overthrown a commonwealth; he had put his own personal will in the place of a system of law and order of some kind; and if he himself sometimes kept his popularity for life, all traces of good will commonly vanished under the rule of his son. That such a tyrant had no means of giving a formal legitimacy to his power is clear on the face of things. When tyrants of exactly the same kind, tyrants of cities, again showed themselves in the commonwealths of mediæval Italy, the means of thus wiping out the original stain was supplied by the power of the Emperor, supreme over all. Not a few of the hereditary dukes and marquesses of Italy were tyrants whom the Imperial authority had raised to the rank of lawful princes. But the old Greek commonwealths knew no overlord; there was no external power that could change Polykratês or Peisistratos into an outwardly lawful

* As for instance Strabo (xiii. p. 631) speaks of the tyrants of Kibyra; *ἐτυραννεῖτο δὲ ἀεί· σωφρόνως δὲ ὅμως.*

ruler of Samos or of Athens. It is perfectly plain that the tyrants of the sixth and fifth centuries before Christ were well pleased to be spoken of as βασιλεύς and that flatterers in prose and verse won their favour by so speaking of them. It is not clear that any tyrant before Agathoklês received or assumed the title in any formal way*. In his day the rise of the various Macedonian princes had made kingship familiar to Greek thought. The Roman tyrant, on the other hand, though he came under the same definition as having taken power to himself without lawful authority, had reached power in a very different way from his Greek predecessor. He had in no way changed the constitution of the state. He had neither suppressed a democracy nor delivered men from an oligarchy. He had simply set up his own power instead of the power of some other prince, and there was no presumption that his rule would be any worse than that of the prince whom he supplanted. He was guilty of whatever amount of human suffering was caused by a revolution wrought by violence; he was not guilty of any general disturbance of the order of things. And it was easy for him, as it was not for the Greek tyrant, to

* I except the case of any cities where the old lawful kingship or some survival of it may have gone on, a point which I may have to discuss elsewhere. See also Plass, Die Tyrannis, i. 262. I doubt if the first Hierôn, for instance, was called βασιλεύς by any but flatterers, Pindar and others. The saying of Diodôros (xi. 26 [see my Hist. Sic. vol. II. Appendices I. and XIII.]) about Gelôn hardly proves it. On the other hand the second Hierôn was undoubtedly βασιλεύς by a real popular vote. Kingship had then become familiar.

obtain a formal and regular confirmation of his authority. In the middle of the third century the most common way of reaching Empire was through the mutinies of the army. The soldiers murdered the reigning Emperor; they chose another in his place; and the Senate presently voted him all the offices, powers, and titles which together made up the practical sovereignty of the Roman commonwealth. He who received his commission from the senate, that extraordinary commission always renewed out of which the Empire grew, became a lawful Emperor; he who could not obtain it remained a tyrant. In the times which we have now reached, the power of the Senate has dwindled away. The Fathers indeed appear by fits and starts, under the strange circumstances of the time, with something nearer to their old authority than had been seen for a long time; but, in the absence of any definite law of succession, it is no longer the vote of the Senate which stands forth as the main source of legitimate power. The Empire is becoming more like an ordinary kingdom, able to pass, either by hereditary descent to the children of the last prince or by adoption to some successor or colleague of his choosing. The joint rule of several princes was now familiar, and this system supplied an easy means of bestowing formal legitimacy on a successful tyrant. When the tyrant had won a certain part of the Empire, and saw no hope of winning the rest, when the lawful prince kept a certain part of the Empire and saw no hope of winning back the rest, a compromise was easy. The lawful prince could admit the tyrant as his

colleague in the Empire, and thus, while raising him to the same level as himself, he could keep at least the rank of *primus inter pares.* The agreement of course, like other agreements, needed not to be kept any longer than was convenient. If either of the new colleagues found a good opportunity of overthrowing his Imperial brother, of taking his dominions to himself or bestowing them on a colleague whom he liked better, that opportunity was seldom missed. The thing had happened over and over again. The lives of Carausius, of Maximus, of the great Constantine himself, supply many and instructive examples.

Constantine then, master of Roman Gaul and Spain, still felt that there was something lacking to his position, and he hastened to make it good. He had torn away the Western lands from the dominion of Honorius; the armies of Honorius had failed to recover the lands that he had torn away; he was seemingly safe in Gaul, while Honorius was anything but safe in Italy. Yet he now stoops, as it might seem to us, to ask his defeated enemy to raise him from his irregular position to a lawful place at his own side. It does indeed mark the force of traditional feeling that Constantine, called to the throne by an army which had shown itself able to maintain him there, still felt himself the upstart, the usurper, the tyrant, and owned the higher position of the Emperor who had come to the diadem by peaceful means, by a line of those adoptions and associations of sons and colleagues which passed for lawful succession. The tyrant therefore sought for the acknowledgement of his claims by the lawful prince; he

sought for his admission as a third Augustus to the imperial fellowship of Honorius and his young nephew in the East. He sent an embassy (409), an embassy of eunuchs—the soldiers from Britain had conformed to the depraved fashion of the time—to the court of Ravenna, asking the Emperor's forgiveness for his taking on himself the imperial rank; it was not, his commissioners were bidden to say, his own act; the presumptuous step had been forced upon him by his soldiers. It is implied, though it is not said in so many words, that Constantine demanded the confirmation of their choice, and his own recognition as an Imperial colleague. Honorius was in no position to resist or refuse; with Alaric and his Goths at no great distance, it was not for him to plunge into another war which might end as the enterprise of Sarus had ended*. A domestic reason

* The embassy is recorded in a fragment of Olympiodôros, p. 450; *Ὅτι Κωνσταντῖνος εἰς τυραννίδα ἀρθεὶς πρεσβεύεται πρὸς Ὀνώριον, ἄκων μὲν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν βιασθεὶς ἀπολογούμενος ἄρξαι, συγγνώμην δὲ αἰτῶν, καὶ τὴν τῆς βασιλείας ἀξιῶν κοινωνίαν. καὶ βασιλεὺς διὰ τὰ ἐνεστηκότα δυσχερῆ τέως καταδέχεται τὴν τῆς βασιλείας κοινωνίαν.* It is here that he stops to explain how Constantine came to be tyrant, *κατὰ τὰς Βρεττανίας δὲ ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος ἐτύγχανεν ἀνηργορεύμενος, στάσει τῶν ἐκεῖσε στρατιωτῶν εἰς ταύτην ἀνηγμένος τὴν ἀρχήν.* He then goes on with the passage quoted above. Zôsimos records this first embassy, v. 43. The last words of the chapter before fix the date to the eighth consulship of Honorius and third of Theodosius, that is the year 409; *ἐπὶ τούτῳ Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ τύραννος εὐνούχους πρὸς Ὀνώριον ἔστελλε, συγγνώμην, αἰτῶν ἕνεκα τοῦ τὴν βασιλείαν ἀνεσχέσθαι λαβεῖν, μηδὲ γὰρ ἐκ προαιρέσεως ἑλέσθαι ταύτην, ἀλλὰ ἀνάγκης αὐτῷ παρὰ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐπαχθείσης. ταύτης ἀκηκοὼς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς αἰτήσεως, θεωρῶν τε ὡς οὐ ῥᾴδιον αὐτῷ τῶν σὺν Ἀλαρίχῳ βαρβάρων οὐ πόρρω ὄντων περὶ πολέμων ἑτέρων διανοεῖσθαι, . . . ἐνδίδωσι ταῖς αἰτήσεσιν.*

also moved him—in this matter Honorius himself may have exercised some measure of personal will. His kinsfolk were in the hands of Constantine—Theodosiolus had brought that news with him; neither he nor Honorius knew that they had been actually put to death before the embassy had been sent, and he deemed that a favourable answer to the demands of their gaoler might be to their advantage*. Honorius therefore acknowledged the claims of Constantine; he sent him a robe of the imperial purple †. The Roman world, so much of it as was still ruled from Ravenna, Constantinople, and Arles, had again three masters.

It would seem that some formality was lacking in this transaction. Or it may simply be that Honorius was stirred to some sign of enmity when the news of the death of Didymus and Verenianus reached him, when he thus saw how he had been in some sort cajoled into an acknowledgement of the tyrant of Gaul. It is certain that later in the year (409) Constantine sent another message to Ravenna, a message carried this time by a more honourable messenger. Its bearer was Jovius, who is described as a man of high culture and of other merits, but whom we have no means to identify with, or to distinguish from, other bearers of his own and like names. He came to Honorius when that prince was not in a position to refuse anything; Alaric was on the point of laying

* Zôsimos, v. 43; *προσέτι γε λόγον ποιούμενος συγγενῶν οἰκείων παρὰ τοῦ τυράννου καταχομένων (οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν Βερηνιανὸς καὶ Διδύμιος) . . . τῶν μὲν οὖν συγγενῶν ἕνεκα ματαίαν εἶχε φροντίδα, πρὸ ταύτης τῆς πρεσβείας ἀποσφαγέντων, τοὺς δὲ εὐνούχους ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀπέπεμπεν.*

† Ib.; *ἐκπέμπει δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ βασιλικὴν ἐσθῆτα.*

siege to Rome*. For the slaughter of the Spanish captives the new envoy made much the same excuse as the earlier messengers had made for Constantine's assumption of the diadem; it had not been done by any orders of Constantine himself†. This statement we may venture to set down as a barefaced falsehood; even the meekness of Honorius was stirred by it, and the words of our account seem to imply that the person of Jovius was in some danger. But the Emperor was partly at least won over by the arguments of the envoy. With Italy in the state in which it was, it would be wise for him to yield, and, if he, Jovius, was allowed to go back in safety to his master, Constantine would presently come to the relief of Rome at the head of the forces of Gaul Spain, and Britain, wherever these last were to be found‡.

This promise, whatever was the real purpose of

* This second embassy comes at the beginning of the last book of Zôsimos, vi. 1; Ἀλάριχος μὲν οὖν . . . ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ἤλαυνε παν-στρατιᾷ, τῇ κατ' αὐτῆς πολιορκίᾳ προσκαρτερήσων. ἐν τούτῳ δὲ παρὰ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ τυραννήσαντος ἐν Κελτοῖς ἀφίκετο πρὸς Ὀνώριον κατὰ πρεσβείαν Ἰόβιος, παιδείᾳ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς διαφέρων, βεβαιωθῆναι τὴν πρότερον ὁμολογηθεῖσαν εἰρήνην, καὶ ἅμα συγγνώμην ἕνεκα τῆς ἀναιρέσεως Διδυμίου καὶ Βερηνιανοῦ τῶν συγγενῶν Ὀνωρίου τοῦ βασιλέως αἰτεῖν.

† Ib.; ἀπελογεῖτο λέγων ὡς οὐ κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἀνῃρηνται Κωνσταντίνου.

‡ Ib.; συντεταραγμένον δὲ τὸν Ὀνώριον θεασάμενος, εὔλογον ἔφασκεν εἶναι ταῖς περὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἐνασχολουμένῳ φροντίσιν ἐνδοῦναι· συγ-χωρούμενος δὲ πρὸς Κωνσταντῖνον ἐκδημῆσαι καὶ τὰ συνέχοντα τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἀγγεῖλαι· μετ' οὐ πολὺ καὶ αὐτὸν ἥξειν ἅμα παντὶ τῷ ἐν Κελτοῖς καὶ ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Βρεταννικῇ νήσῳ στρατεύματι ταῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ Ῥώμην βοηθήσοντα περιστάσεσι. καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἰόβιος ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀναχωρεῖν ἐπετράπη.

Constantine in making it, leads us for a moment into the midst of the affairs of Italy. We are, as we have seen, in the memorable year (409) of Alaric's second siege of Rome, at that stage of it when the successive ministers or masters of Honorius are stepping into one another's places with amazing speed. The eunuch Eusebius has become the Emperor's chief chamberlain, and Allobich, a barbarian, perhaps a Frank, has been placed in command of the Roman cavalry. The chief authority at Ravenna is naturally in the hands of the eunuch; but the brute force of the master of the horse prevails over the subtler influence of the chamberlain; when the colleagues no longer agree, Eusebius is publicly beaten to death with rods under the eyes of Honorius*.

* Our narrative has at this point to be put together from three sources, Olympiodôros, Zôsimos, and Sôzomen, each of whom fills up gaps in the other, without contradicting. We must remember that both Zôsimos and Sôzomen had most likely read Olympiodôros in a more perfect state. Neither Orosius nor the Annalists help us just now, and Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus tells us only (Greg. Tur. ii. 9) that Constantine at this moment had "nullum ex Italia metum."

The exaltation of Eusebius is mentioned by Olympiodôros (p. 452), who does not mention that of Allobich, which is recorded by Zôsimos, v. 48. But Zôsimos does not mention the fate either of Eusebius or of Allobich. His account is; *καταστήσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς* [Ὁνώριος] *Εὐσέβιον μὲν ἀντὶ Τερεντίου φύλακα τοῦ κοιτῶνος . . . καὶ μετὰ Βιγελάντιον Ἀλλόβιχον ἵππαρχον καταστήσας, τὴν μὲν τῶν στρατιωτῶν παύειν πως ἔδοξε στάσιν.* Olympiodôros says; *μετέρχεται κατὰ τὴν Ῥάβενναν ἐπὶ τὸν πραιπόσιτον Εὐσέβιον ἡ δυναστεία. ὃς μετὰ ἱκανὸν χρόνον Ἀλλοβίχου ἐπηρείᾳ καὶ ὑποθήκῃ δημοσίᾳ καὶ ἐπ' ὄψεσι τοῦ βασιλέως ῥάβδοις ἀναιρεῖται.* Δυναστεία is a remarkable word to be used of the ascendency of a minister, even of an eunuch under Honorius.

At this moment Constantine steps in; we read in two independent narratives that he entered Italy with an army; but we get exactly opposite statements as to the motive which took him thither. In one version he is marching to Ravenna, to confirm or to carry out his engagements with Honorius, that is doubtless to give help to his Italian colleague against the Goth *. In the other version the master of Gaul and Spain sets out to add Italy to his dominions †. We may therefore assume with safety that the one version represents the purpose that was openly avowed, and the other the purpose which was commonly suspected. There is no reason to suppose any open breach with Honorius so soon after the

Πραιπόσιτος should be noticed as one of the Latin official names which were creeping into Greek, though as yet sparingly. The exact force of *ὑποθήκη δημοσία* I do not profess to understand, any more than Labbe did.

* So says Olympiodôros, p. 452; *Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ τύραννος . . . ἐπειγόμενος πρὸς Ῥάβενναν ὥστε σπείσασθαι Ὀνωρίῳ.* This was doubtless what was given out publicly.

† Sôzomen, ix. 12; *Κωνσταντῖνος τέως κατὰ γνώμην πράττειν δοκῶν, Κώνσταντα τὸν υἱὸν ἀντὶ Καίσαρος βασιλέα καταστήσας, ἐβουλεύετο τὴν Ἰταλίαν καταλαβεῖν.* That was doubtless what the court of Ravenna feared.

It certainly seems strange that Gregory's authority, Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus, altogether leaves out Constantine's Italian expedition. It is just when it should come that he tells us (Greg. Tur. ii. 9) that Constantine was "gulæ et ventri deditus," having "nullum ex Italia metum." Does that mean after his return from Italy?

I do not see on what ground Wietersheim (ii. 166) places the Italian expedition in 410. Surely the whole story of Eusebius and Allobich fixes it to 409, while Alaric was still only threatening Rome.

second embassy. Constantine appears to have assumed the consulship in partnership with Honorius*; and on the whole it is most likely that it was now, when he was at the height of his power, that he raised his son Constans, who might pass for the conqueror of Spain, from the rank of Cæsar to that of Augustus†. There would thus be four acknow-

* I might not have found out this consulship of Honorius and Constantine, which is not to be found in any *fasti* and which was most likely unheard of outside of Constantine's dominions, but from the mention of it by Tillemont, v. 570, and the references there given. The inscription which is given in Gruter 1072 comes from the church of Saint Paullinus at Trier, and, being in Greek, throws, as usual, some light on the spelling and pronunciation of that tongue. It runs thus;

ENΘA · KEITE · EYCEBIA · EN
EIPHNHI · OYCA · IEPOKΩMITI ·
AΠO · I · KΩMHC AΔΔANΩN ZHCAC
HMEP · Ō ΠPOC · ETΩN Ī · EN
YΠATEIA · ONΩPIOY TO H̄ · KAI
KΩNCTANTINOY · TO · Ā · MHNI
ΠANHMOY IB̄ · HMEPA ·
KĪ · B̄ · EN EIPHNH.

The year is 409. One must suppose that Constantine, on receiving the purple from Honorius, declared himself consul, without regard to the rights of Theodosius.

How much lost history might have been kept if all makers of epitaphs had put the consuls.

† So says Sôzomen in the passage (ix. 12) quoted above, where he distinctly places it before the Italian expedition of Constantine. I am not sure that this is really contradicted by Zôsimos, who does not mention that expedition, when he says (vi. 13), after recording the hostageship of Placidius, *τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἐν τούτοις ἦν· Κωνσταντῖνος δὲ τῷ παιδὶ Κώνστᾳ τὸ διάδημα περιθεὶς καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ Καίσαρος βασιλέα πεποιηκὼς, Ἀπολλινάριον παραλύσας τῆς ἀρχῆς ἕτερον ἀντ' αὐτοῦ ὕπαρχον ὑπέδειξεν.* Sôzomen's date seems more distinctly given as

ledged Imperial colleagues, Honorius, Theodosius, Constantine, and Constans; the making of Emperors was still for a moment in Roman hands; it was very soon to pass to the Goth.

Thus, in all outward seeming, help was coming from Arles to Ravenna. But it was deemed at the court of Ravenna that such help was likely to be dangerous; it was believed that there were high officials about the Italian Augustus who were ready to displace him in favour of his Gaulish brother. Allobich, slayer of Eusebius, had won power, but not confidence; he was suspected of being in league with Constantine to transfer to him the whole dominion of the West*. It would seem that Honorius, as princes sometimes do, conspired against his minister and found instruments ready to rid him of the suspected traitor. An opportunity was found as Allobich was riding, according to custom, in a solemn procession before his sovereign. Allobich was cut down by the loyal assassins, and the Emperor, springing down from his horse, gave God thanks in the hearing of all men for having preserved him from a manifest traitor†. So sultan-like had the

a date, while that of Zôsimos comes in more casually. And Olympiodôros (p. 453), though he too only mentions the matter incidentally, clearly places it before the revolt of Gerontius. That revolt took place *Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ τυράννου καὶ Κώνσταντος τοῦ παιδὸς, ὃς πρότερον μὲν Καῖσαρ, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς ἐκεχειροτόνητο, τούτων ἡττηθέντων καὶ πεφευγότων.*

* Sôzomen, ix. 12; *ὃν* [Ἀλλόβιχον] *δὴ στρατηγὸν Ὀνωρίου ὄντα καὶ ὕποπτον ὡς Κωνσταντίνῳ πραγματευόμενον πᾶσαν τὴν πρὸς τὴν δύσιν ἡγεμονίαν.*

† Olympiodôros (p. 452) records the death of Allobich; Ἀλλό-

dominion of Rome become that murder was the only way to forestall or to avenge murder. The truth of the suspicion against Allobich seems to be confirmed by the fact that Constantine, when he heard of his death on his march, turned back, as if his schemes had become altogether hopeless now that his confederate was gone. He had crossed the Cottian Alps and had kept on the left side of the Po till he reached Verona. He was making ready to turn southward, and to cross the river on his way to Ravenna, when the news of Allobich's death met him. He then went back by the way by which he had come, to find troubles enough in the lands of which he was supposed to be the ruler without adding the defence of Italy against Alaric to his other difficulties *.

His troubles indeed had begun before he started for Ravenna. Spain had quietly submitted to the

βιχος μετὰ βραχὺ, τὴν ἐφ' ᾧ τὸν πραιπόσιτον Εὐσέβιον ἀνεῖλε δίκην τινὼν, γνώμῃ τοῦ βασιλέως κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀναιρεῖται. Sôzomen (ix. 12) gives the details; *ἀναιρεθῆναι συνέβη τότε [τὸν Ἀλλόβιχον], προηγούμενον, ὡς ἔθος, ἐπανιόντος ἐκ προούδου τινὸς τοῦ κρατοῦντος. ἡνίκα δὴ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτίκα τοῦ ἵππου ἀποβὰς, δημοσίᾳ εὐχαριστήρια τῷ θεῷ ηὔξατο, ὡς προφανοῦς ἐπιβούλου ἀπαλλαγείς.* Ὁ *κρατῶν* seems an odd word for the Emperor. On this passage Gibbon (vol. v. p. 289) remarks that the "assassination of Allobich, in the midst of a public procession, is the only circumstance of his life in which Honorius discovered the faintest symptom of courage or resentment."

* Olympiodôros, p. 452; *Κωνσταντῖνος . . . τὸν Ἀλλοβίχου θάνατον μαθὼν . . . φοβηθεὶς ὑποστρέφει.* Sôzomen, ix. 12; *παραμείψας τὰς Κοττίας Ἄλπεις, ἦκεν εἰς Λιβερῶνα πόλιν τῆς Λιγουρίας. μέλλων δὲ περαιοῦσθαι τὸν Ἠριδανὸν, τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἀνέστρεφε, μαθὼν τὸν Ἀλλοβίχου θάνατον . . . Κωνσταντῖνος δὲ φεύγων τὴν Ἀρήλατον κατελαβε.*

change of rulers in the first instance, and the land might, it would seem, have settled down quietly again after the movement of the kinsmen of Honorius, if the new administration had not wounded local feeling in a very tender point. Spain, as we have seen, had been used to be defended by the arms of her own children. The legions that served in Spain had been Spanish legions, and the keeping of the Pyrenæan passes had been by usage entrusted to what we may call a national militia. Spain had no frontiers through which the barbarians could make their way; she was not therefore, like Italy and the East, accustomed to have her borders guarded by one body of barbarians hired to keep out another body of their fellows. But now Constantine and Constans were guilty of the fatal, yet not unnatural, mistake of removing the local force, and entrusting the mountain passes to the keeping of their own barbarian allies, the Honorians. These troops were further indulged, by their commander Gerontius, it would seem in excessive licence in the way of plunder; they were above all allowed to harry the district of Valentia, which, doubtless as having supported the cause of Didymus and Verenianus, was dealt with as an enemy's country. The demand of the Spanish legions that the barbarians might be withdrawn, and the old state of things restored, was refused, and great discontent arose*. To quiet or suppress that discontent

* This very interesting notice of the local usages of the Spanish provinces comes in different shapes from Zôsimos, Orosius, and Sôzomen. The first of these (vi. 5), to the passage quoted above p. 75, mentioning Gerontius as left in command in Spain, adds,

the new Augustus Constans was sent. He went, as far as we can see from our fragmentary authorities, about the time of his father's Italian expedition. It is plain that the Spanish troubles were laid to the charge of the officers whom Constans had left to represent his father in the peninsula. He now took with him a general named Justus, destined, it would seem, to supplant Gerontius, while Apollinaris lost his office of Præfect, which was bestowed on a certain Decimius Rusticus, who had hitherto been Master of the Offices*. The wrath of Gerontius was naturally

καίτοι γε τῶν ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ στρατοπέδων ἐμπιστευθῆναι κατὰ τὸ σύνηθες τὴν φυλακὴν αἰτησάντων, καὶ μὴ ξένοις ἐπιτραπῆναι τὴν τῆς χώρας ἀσφάλειαν. So Sôzomen (ix. 12), *ὁ μὲν Κώνστας . . . ἐπανῆλθε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, φρουρὰν καταστήσας ἀπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν, τῆς ἐπὶ τὰς Σπανίας παρόδου, ἣν δεομένοις Σπάνοις κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἔθος φυλάττειν οὐκ ἐπέτρεψεν.* But the most graphic picture is that of Orosius, vii. 40. After the passage quoted on p. 66 he goes on; "His barbaris [Honoriacis] quasi in pretium victoriæ prædandi in Palatinis campis licentia data: dehinc supradicti montis claustrorumque eis cura permissa est, remota rusticanorum fideli et utili custodia. Igitur Honoriaci imbuti præda et illecti abundantia," &c.

* This has to be put together in a curious way. In Zôsimos, vi. 5, we read, *Κώνστας αὖθις ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς εἰς τὴν Ἰβηρίαν ἐκπέμπεται, Ἰοῦστον ἐπαγόμενος.* It is only later, in connexion with the appointment of Constans as Augustus, that he mentions (vi. 13, see note above) the deposition of Apollinaris. Yet we have seen that the appointment of Constans must have come earlier than it is placed by Zôsimos, and the substitution of new officers for Gerontius and for Apollinaris is likely to have been at the same time. It is not so much that the chronology of Zôsimos is really confused as that he mentions things when they happen to come into his head without regard to order. The name of the successor of Apollinaris comes from a notice of Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus (Greg. Tur. ii. 9) a little later; "Præfectus jam Decimius Rusticus ex officiorum

kindled, and he would seem, so far as we can make out from most unsatisfactory records of most important events, to have entered on a scheme of treason of the widest kind, which in its results changed the whole history of Western Europe. He leagued himself with the barbarians, Vandals, Alans, and Suevians, who had been laying waste the greater part of Gaul for the last two years. He seems to have bound himself to them (409) by some kind of formal treaty*. How far it amounted to a regular partition

magistro." This deposition of his grandfather may have been one reason why Sidonius speaks of the inconstancy of Constantine (see the passage quoted above). It is on more public grounds that Orosius (vii. 40) brands him as "sine merito virtutis."

* It is not easy just now to fit events into their exact order, as whether the proclamation of Maximus, which is not dated, came before the barbarian invasion of Spain which is fixed to the autumn of 409 or after it (see Wietersheim, ii. 162). I should think that the proclamation came first. The only thing against it is the order of events in Sôzomen; but none of the writers whom we have to follow attend to strict chronological order; one thing is suggested by another, and out it comes, whether in exact order or not. But the connexion of the two things, that both formed parts of one scheme, that Gerontius, to secure himself against Constantine, favoured the coming of the barbarians into the peninsula, that he even made a treaty with them, are things which seem distinctly made out.

Sôzomen (ix. 12, 13) is not very clear either in his order of facts or in his notions of causes. After the passage quoted above he goes on, *ὃ καὶ αἴτιον γέγονε μετὰ ταῦτα τῆς ἀπωλείας τῶν τῇδε· καταπεσούσης γὰρ τῆς Κωνσταντίνου δυνάμεως, ἀναλαβόντες ἑαυτοὺς Οὐανδαλοί τε καὶ Σοῦϊβοι καὶ Ἀλανοὶ, ἔθνη βάρβαρα, τῆς παρόδου ἐκράτησαν, καὶ πολλὰ φρούρια καὶ πόλεις τῶν Ἱσπανῶν καὶ Γαλατῶν εἷλον καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τοῦ τυράννου.* He then gives the account of Constantine's expedition to Italy, as already quoted. The words cited in the

of Spain it is impossible to say; but the practical result was that, very much as in the case of Gaul, the Roman authority was kept up in a corner of the land, while the rest was left to the mercy of the invaders. But the representation of Roman authority in Spain, as it had passed from Honorius to Constantine, was now to pass from Constantine to Gerontius or to any

note on p. 91 are followed by a slight reference to the presence of Constans in Spain, *κατὰ ταὐτὸν δὲ καὶ Κώνστας ὁ αὐτοῦ παῖς φεύγων ἐκ τῆς Ἱσπανίας.* He then again tells of the barbarian invasion, partly in the same words as before but more carefully; *καταπεσούσης γὰρ τῆς Κωνσταντίνου δυνάμεως, ἀναλαβόντες ἑαυτοὺς Οὐανδαλοί τε καὶ Σοῦϊβοι καὶ Ἀλανοὶ, σπουδῇ τὸ Πυρηναῖον ὄρος κατέλαβον, εὐδαίμονα καὶ πλησιωτάτην τὴν χώραν ἀκούοντες. παρημελημένων τε τῶν ἐπιτραπέντων παρὰ Κώνσταντος τὴν φρουρὰν τῆς παρόδου, παρῆλθον εἰς Ἱσπανίαν.* He then, at the beginning of his next chapter, records the elevation of Maximus as happening *ἐν τούτῳ.*

Sôzomen here does not personally connect Gerontius with the barbarian entry, but he attributes it to the negligence or treachery of the Honorians under his command. Orosius is to the same effect, but somewhat more explicit. After the words cited above from vii. 40, he adds, "Prodita Pyrenei custodia, claustrisque patefactis cunctas gentes quæ per Gallias vagabantur, Hispaniarum provinciis immittunt, *iisdemque ipsi adjunguntur.*"

Olympiodôros (p. 453) seems distinctly to connect Gerontius personally with the barbarian inroad; *Γερόντιος ὁ στρατηγὸς τὴν πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους ἀσμενίσας εἰρήνην, Μάξιμον . . . βασιλέα ἀναγορεύει.* So Zôsimos, vi. 5. Constans enters Spain with Justus, *ἐφ' ᾧ Γερόντιος ἀχθόμενος, καὶ τοὺς αὐτόθι περιποιησάμενος στρατιώτας, ἐπανίστησι Κωνσταντίνῳ τοὺς ἐν Κελτοῖς βαρβάρους.* He goes on to speak of Constantine's dealings in return with other barbarians, but says nothing about Maximus. Renatus too (Greg. Tur. ii. 9) is clear on this head, though it is hard to work in some of the details of his story; "Ab Hispania nuntii commeant a Gerontio Maximum . . . imperio præditum atque in se [Constantinum et Constantem] comitatu gentium barbararum accinctum parari."

one whom Gerontius might think good to clothe with the purple. We are so seldom taken behind the scenes, so seldom allowed to study the motives of the actors in this most confused story, that we can merely guess why Gerontius, instead of laying claim to the Imperial dignity in his own person, set up a certain Maximus as Emperor or tyrant. The proclamation of some rival Emperor was his only chance; but we can do no more than guess at the causes which made Gerontius forbear from placing the diadem on his own brow. We see easily why at this very moment Alaric was setting up a puppet Emperor in Italy for his own ends, why later in the century Ricimer set up and put down Emperors at pleasure. For the days had not yet come for an avowed barbarian to mount the throne of the Cæsars in his own person. Stilicho, charged with plotting the elevation of his son Eucherius, is a nearer case to this of Gerontius. But Stilicho was said to come of the stock of the Vandals*. The lapse of another generation, the connexion by marriage between his house and that of the Emperor's, may have caused the son to be looked on as more Roman than the father. But Gerontius would seem to have been a provincial of the province of Britain, as good a Roman then, by the edict of Antoninus, as any man in Spain, Gaul, or Italy. It is therefore by no means easy to see, why, when he risked himself

* If we may believe his enemy Orosius (vii. 38), "Comes Stilico Wandalorum imbellis, avaræ, perfidæ, et dolosæ gentis genere editus." "Imbellis" at least is a strange epithet; but Livy and Gregory of Tours have equally strange sayings about Latins and West-Goths.

L. of C.

and all that belonged to him in a struggle for power, in a struggle against Honorius and Constantine at once, he did not at least run the risk on his own behalf and in his own name. Whatever were his motives, the fact is clear. It was not himself but Maximus whom Gerontius chose for the dangerous honour. But who was Maximus? That one among our authorities who is on the whole the most trustworthy, but whose evidence has come down to us in the most fragmentary state, seems to call him the son of Gerontius, in which case we should have the closest parallel of all to the alleged designs of Stilicho. He was, it is said, serving among the *domestics*, the household troops doubtless of Constantine and Constans. Other writers speak more vaguely of Maximus as a friend or dependant of Gerontius. In any case, just as with Constantine himself, the name of the renowned British tyrant of the last century may have gone some way towards securing his elevation, though we are also told that Gerontius deemed him a man personally fit for the post*. Maximus therefore

* Olympiodôros (453) calls Maximus the son of Gerontius; *Μάξιμον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ παῖδα, εἰς τὴν δομεστίκων τάξιν τελοῦντα, βασιλέα ἀναγορεύει.* Sôzomen's account (ix. 13) is, *Γερόντιος ὁ τῶν Κωνσταντίνου στρατηγῶν ἄριστος, δυσμενὴς αὐτῷ γέγονεν, ἐπιτήδειόν τε εἰς τυραννίδα Μάξιμον τὸν αὐτοῦ οἰκεῖον νομίσας, βασιλικὴν ἐνέδυσεν ἐσθῆτα.* Renatus, in the passage before quoted, calls him "Maximum, unum e clientibus suis." Wietersheim prefers the witness of Olympiodôros, which is doubtless the best in itself. But it is hard to see how a son could be mistaken for anything else, while a stranger might be more easily mistaken for a son. Orosius (vii. 42) puts the whole story of Gerontius and Maximus out of date; "Constantem filium Constantini Gerontius comes suus, vir nequam, magis quam probus, apud Viennam interfecit, atque in ejus locum Maximum quemdam

assumed the purple and held his court at Tarragona*. Master of at least the north-eastern corner of Spain, he found himself better able to maintain his authority against other representatives of the Roman power than he was against the common enemies of the Roman name.

We cannot have a better illustration of the way in which these tyrants rose and fell than in the story of Gerontius, a story full of striking adventure, on which we have now entered. As Constantine has done by Honorius, so Gerontius now does by Constantine. All alike are Emperors to those who accept their dominion, tyrants to all beyond its bounds. The truth is that, during the whole life of the Roman power, down to the disputes of a Palaiologos and a Kantakouzênos, the only chance for a man at the head of an army who had fallen under the suspicion of the master whom he was supposed to serve was to assume the purple himself. It was a frightful risk; but he might succeed; otherwise he had no hope. Thus the Empire was torn in pieces by the personal interests of particular men, at a moment when no one frontier was safe against foreign enemies. Yet the wonderful thing is how often the Empire came together again. What strikes us at every step in the tangled history of these times

substituit." This account would be true, if only the order of the two facts was turned about. This neglect of chronology comes of the fact that Orosius, after recording the events at the Pyrenees, goes off into an edifying discourse on the doings of the barbarians in Spain, and now comes back to give a "catalogus tyrannorum."

* Sôzomen, u. s.; *ἐν Ταρακόνῃ διάγειν εἴασεν.*

is the wonderful life which the Roman name and the Roman power still kept when it was thus attacked on every side from without and torn in pieces in every quarter from within. The personal good luck of Honorius has been noticed both in older and in later times*; like the Persian conqueror of old, he overcame most of his enemies without stirring from his hearth†, and those whom he could not overcome he at least outlived. But the good luck, if not of the local Rome, at least of the wider Romania, is still more to be noticed. Whatever blows fall, something escapes, and that something commonly lives; it grows again, and wins back part at least of what had been lost. At this moment the whole West is overrun by barbarian invasion. Britain falls away; Gaul is ravaged from the Rhine to the Pyrenees; the greater part of Spain, as we shall presently see, is cut up into barbarian kingdoms. By a blow more striking and terrible than all in its historic and dramatic aspect, Rome itself has been entered and sacked by a barbarian enemy. Yet the Roman name and the Roman power live on. The dominion of the conqueror of Rome passes to a successor who is ready to act as the soldier of Rome and who aspires to be the son and brother of her princes. While Italy is thus saved by the exchange of Alaric for Atawulf, neither Gaul nor Spain is wholly lost.

* Sôzomen (ix. 16) is strong on this head. See also Procopius, Bell. Vand. i. 2, and Gibbon.

† Æsch. Pers. 860–63;

ὅσσας δ' εἶλε πόλεις πόρον
οὐ διαβὰς Ἅλυος ποταμοῖο,
οὐδ' ἀφ' ἑστίας συθείς.

A corner of Gaul escapes barbarian ravage; a corner of Spain escapes barbarian partition. And if at this moment neither Gaul nor Spain is in the obedience of Ravenna, if each land has its own Emperor or tyrant, yet the tyrants at once turn their arms against one another, and all presently yield to the fortunate star of the lawful prince. And if that lawful prince wins his victories by deputy, one at least of his enemies suffers defeat by deputy also.

Maximus then is tyrant at this moment in Spain, reigning at Tarragona, but without any such acknowledgement of his position as Constantine had won from the unwilling Honorius. His immediate enemy was Constantine, whose power in Spain he had overthrown; more immediately again it was Constans by whom his father Constantine had been represented in Spain. But Constans, though the greater part of his father's forces were under his command*, could not stand against the movement which had raised Maximus to power. He and his præfect, Decimius Rusticus, who, we may gather, was specially unpopular, fled into Gaul to Constantine†. From his capital at

* Τοῦ πλείονος τῆς δυνάμεως μέρους ὄντος ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ says Zôsimos (vi. 5), but his account is confused, and he mentions nothing of the acts of Constans, or indeed of Constantine, after Constans went into Spain with Justus.

† It is again excessively hard to put our accounts together. Olympiodôros (453) tells us how, Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Κώνσταντος . . . ἡττηθέντων καὶ πεφευγότων, Gerontius sets up Maximus as Emperor, εἶτα ἐπιδιώξας Κώνσταντα, κατεπράξατο ἀναιρεθῆναι, καὶ κατὰ πόδας εἵπετο, διώκων καὶ τὸν πατέρα Κωνσταντῖνον. One would think from this that Constantine as well as Constans was in Spain; yet every other picture places him at Gaul, and Olympiodôros himself speaks of

Arles that prince—an acknowledged colleague of Honorius and Theodosius—had to keep, if he could, so much of Gaul as was still Roman from the attack which was threatening from Spain. Maximus himself did not stir, any more than Honorius; but

him at Arles directly after. Nor would any one find out the presence of Constans at Vienne. Sôzomen (ix. 12, 13) is a little clearer, though he tells his tale in a somewhat strange order. After the return of Constantine from Italy comes the passage cited in a former note; Κωνσταντῖνος δὲ φεύγων τὴν Ἀρήλατον κατέλαβε, κατὰ ταὐτὸν δὲ καὶ Κώνστας δ' αὐτοῦ παῖς φεύγων ἐκ τῆς Ἱσπανίας. Then, as an explanation, follows his second account of the barbarian invasion of Spain above quoted; then Gerontius makes Maximus Emperor and leaves him at Tarragona, αὐτὸς δὲ Κωνσταντίνῳ ἐπεστράτευσεν, ἐν παρόδῳ Κώνσταντα τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν Βιέννῃ ὄντα ἀναιρεθῆναι παρασκευάσας. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔμαθε Κωνσταντῖνος τὰ κατὰ Μάξιμον, Ἐδόβιχον μὲν τὸν αὐτοῦ στρατηγὸν πέραν τοῦ Ῥήνου πέπομφεν, Φράγγων τε καὶ Ἀλαμανῶν συμμαχίαν προτρεψάμενον, Κώνσταντι δὲ τῷ αὐτοῦ παιδὶ Βιέννης καὶ τῶν τῇδε πόλεων τὴν φυλακὴν ἐπέτρεψε. Καὶ Γερόντιος μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀρήλατον ἐλάσας, ἐπολιόρκει τὴν πόλιν. This almost reads as if it had been carelessly copied from two sources, one of them the same as that used by Olympiodôros. The account of Renatus (Greg. Tur. ii. 9) is yet more confused. He makes Constans still with his father—surely in Gaul—where "ab Hispania nuntii commeant a Gerontio Maximum unum e clientibus suis imperio præditum atque in comitatu gentium barbararum accinctum parari. Quo exterriti Edobeco ad Germaniæ gentes præmisso, Constans et præfectus jam Decimius Rusticus [see above, note p. 96] ex officiorum magistro, petunt Gallias, cum Francis et Alamannis omnique militum manu ad Constantinum jamjamque rediturí." Here we get some of the same facts as in Sôzomen, but in a strange [succession]. Constans, who is already with his father in Gaul, is made to go into Gaul to seek for German allies, an errand on which Edobich is already sent. In the scraps that we have in Gregory, there is nothing about the fate of Constans, but directly after Constantine is besieged somewhere, clearly at Arles. Olympiodôros thus fancies father and son

Gerontius, in league with the barbarians who had passed into Spain (411), bringing with him no doubt not a few of them as his allies and soldiers*, set off to follow Constans, and doubtless to win the dominions of Constantine for the prince whom he had himself set up. Constantine made preparations to defend the cities of his dominions and to gain barbarian allies. On this latter errand the Frank Edobich was sent beyond the Rhine to collect a force both of his own countrymen and of the Alamans. Nearer home too Constantine, like his rivals, did his main work by deputy; he seems to have shut himself up at Arles, and to have entrusted the general care of his territories to his son Constans, whose headquarters were at Vienne†. That post, so far from the southern frontier, so far north even from Arles, seems strangely chosen when an invading host was actually on the march from Spain. To one very careful inquirer it

to be both in Spain, while Renatus fancies them both to be in Gaul, though directly after he makes Constans "petere Gallias." Sôzomen alone brings out that Constantine had come back from Italy to Gaul, while Constans fled from Spain to meet him. The narrative of Sôzomen in short hangs together, save that he oddly puts the death of Constans before his commission from his father, and that he clearly mistook the geographical relations of Arles and Vienne. The odd statement of Renatus that Constans "Gallias petit" to seek for German allies may suggest that he was sent northward from Arles to co-operate in some way with Edobich. On the whole I think we may put together some such narrative as I have given in the text. The confusions in all our authorities are very wonderful, but it is only fair to remember that, while we have the connected work of Sôzomen, we have only scraps of Renatus and Olympiodôros.

* This may be [gathered] from the words of Renatus.

† So I infer from Sôzomen compared with Renatus.

has seemed so hard to believe that the tale that we are telling happened at Vienne that he has ventured to suggest that the mention of the capital of the Allobroges must be simply a mistake, and that the headquarters of Constans were really at Narbonne*. Truly Narbo Martius is geographically far better suited than Vienna Allobrogum to be the headquarters of a ruler of south-eastern Gaul who is looking for an invasion from Spain. But it is dangerous to reconstruct history according to what, from a geographical or a military point of view, ought to have happened. When such authorities as we have—not, to be sure, a Thucydides or a Procopius—place Constans at Vienne, I cannot take upon me arbitrarily to translate him to Narbonne. And, after all, something might be said for the presence of the younger Augustus at Vienne at such a moment. The most natural inference is that Constantine himself was at Arles, that to him was left the immediate defence of Gaul against Maximus and his partisans,

* So Fauriel, i. 101. The question really comes to this. Sôzomen distinctly places this event at Vienne; but by the use of the words ἐν παρόδῳ he shows that he did not understand the geography of Vienne, while ἐν παρόδῳ would exactly suit Narbonne. Is he more likely to have got hold of the right geography with the wrong name, or to have got the right name but to have confused the geography? To me it seems more likely that he should have heard the name rightly as Vienne, but that, having no clear notion of the position of Vienne or of any special reasons for Constans being there, he should fancy that Vienne was on the natural road from Spain, rather than that he should get hold of the name of Vienne when the thing really happened at Narbonne. But every man must judge for himself.

while his more enterprising son fixed himself in a city well fitted either as a bulwark against hostile barbarians from central Gaul*, or as a trysting-place for friendly barbarians from beyond the Rhine. And in the economy of things, when south-eastern Gaul was for a moment, as it has been in some later moments, the chief centre of history in lands beyond the Alps, when each of the great cities of the land had to stand a siege or to witness a revolution, it could not be that no place in the story should be found for so noble a city as the true Vienna, the city of the Allobroges, the city whose walls and whose churches still shelter the dust of more than one of the unkindly forgotten Kings of the Middle Kingdom. Seated, like her fellows, by the broad Rhone, not girded by the waters like the Arelate of those days, not perched on her steep like the Gaulish Valentia, but nestling as it were in the arena of an amphitheatre of hills, the great river itself sweeping through as if ready for the sports of the *naumachia*, Vienna could then show, whole and perfect, those mighty masses of brickwork whose ruins it is now not always easy to distinguish from the face of the hills that they so boldly climbed. The church of the Primate of Primates, the head, so men at Vienna deemed, of all the Burgundies, had not yet arisen in that vast unbroken length that took six centuries to lead to its full extent at either end. But the basilica in which Avitus ministered may well have been already standing, and that lovely relic of pagan days, second only to its fellow temple at

* This is suggested by the words of Zôsimos; *ἐπανίστησι* [Γερόντιος] Κωνσταντίνῳ τοὺς ἐν Κελτοῖς βαρβάρους.

Nemausus, was there untouched by age and havoc, perhaps already a house of worship of the new faith of Rome and Gaul. The obelisk between the walls, the shattered theatre within them, the amphitheatre whose site we now faintly trace, the whole range of buildings rising tier on tier, colonnade on colonnade, must have made Vienna a prouder city to meet the eyes of the advancing enemy than that he hurried by on the Valentine hill or even among the lagunes of Imperial Arelate. It was indeed a prize for kings to strive which Constans guarded for his father, which Gerontius attacked, it may be for his son. But again not a word is vouchsafed to us to tell how Vienna fell into the hands of the patron of the new tyrant of Spain. We know not whether the city was stormed or whether it surrendered. We know only that Constans came into the power of Gerontius, and was put to death by the conqueror*.

From the city defended by the son Gerontius marched to the city defended, or at least dwelled in, by the father. The Briton who had followed Constantine from his island now laid siege to his master of yesterday in the august home that he had helped to win for him. In reading this story, the story of the double siege of Arles, we must bear in mind the topography of the country as it stood at the beginning of the fifth century†. The inlets of the sea, which

* Orosius (vii. 42); "Constantem . . . Gerontius comes suus . . . apud Viennam interfecit."

† On the ancient topography of Arles and the whole country generally see the works of Lenthéric, specially La Grèce et L'Orient en Provence, chap. iii., and the plan at page 311.

form so marked a feature on the journey from Arles to the Provençal Aix, were then far more numerous and came much further inland than they do now; and the branches of the river were then many more than the Great and the Little Rhone that are now left. Arles was, then as now, parted from her great suburb—far greater then as the *Colonia Julia Paterna* than it is now as the *Fauxbourg de Trinquetailles*—by the main stream of the river, yoked by its bridge, better represented in site by the bridge that now carries the railway than by the bridge which forms the ordinary communication between city and suburb. But waters that are now dried up gave both city and suburb a peninsular shape which they keep no longer. The city itself was washed to the east by a deep inlet of the Mediterranean which formed the *Statio Navium* of Arelate. The Elysian Fields stretched their long lines of sarcophagi between its banks and the city walls that rose above them. The plain which reaches almost to the foot of the little Alps was then a sea; the hills crowned by the holy place of Montmajeur, by the giants' chamber on the height of Cordes, by the rock-hewn dwellings of Les Baux, were then islands in the water, as Avalon and its West-Saxon fellows still were in the days of Ælfred. Against the city thus fenced in by art and nature two armies marched at the same moment, each hostile alike to one another and to its defenders. For while Gerontius was marching from Vienne by the high way that, like the modern railway, skirts the left, the eastern, bank of the river, another army was on its march from Italy. The lord of Ravenna, however

unable to save Rome, could now (411)—when he that had threatened Rome had passed away, when Atawulf ruled the Goths in the place of Alaric—find leisure and means to think again of the lands beyond the Alps. And he had those about him who could win back Arles to his obedience, and who could rid him alike of the unwelcome colleague by whom Arles was defended, and of the avowed rebel by whom it was besieged.

This last distinction, the fact that Constantine held the formal place of a lawful Augustus, must never be forgotten. Yet it is hardly wonderful if the distinction between colleague and rebel was not accurately drawn at the court of Ravenna. The acknowledgement of Constantine by Honorius as an Imperial colleague had hardly been an act of the free will either of Honorius himself or of those by whom he was guided. He no doubt personally felt some grudge against his fellow Emperor on account of the slaughter of his kinsmen, and none the less perhaps because of the pretences by which that slaughter had been feebly excused. And the appearance of Constantine in Italy, an appearance which allowed of so many interpretations, might well be looked on as cancelling all claims on the part of the tyrant of Gaul to be looked on as any longer a fellow Emperor with the son and grandson of Theodosius. Constantine was now looked on as an enemy (411); the enterprise of Sarus was undertaken again with better luck; a force was now sent into Gaul to recover that province, or those parts of it in which the Roman name still bore rule, from the obedience of Constantine

to the obedience of Honorius. A new actor in our story appears in command of the host that was sent on this errand. Constantius, at a later time to be the third Emperor of that name, may be looked on as in some sort continuing that great line of Illyrian princes which had given the Roman power a renewed life. Born at Naïssus, bearing one of the great names of the Flavian house, if he did not actually share the blood of the elder Constantii and Constantini, he must at least have inherited their traditions. Schooled in the wars of Theodosius*, he was the best captain that Rome had left, and he had some merits beyond those of the mere man of war. We see in him traces of the generosity and greatness of soul of an older day, and there is something which calls for sympathy in his abiding love for the august lady, Roman princess and Gothic queen, whose marriage in the end raised him to the throne. He is brought into our story as the future husband of Placidia, the future father of the last Valentinian†; but he may fairly claim a place on his own account as at least one of the least evil in a bad time. We are told in a marked way that Constantius at this stage was a man of many virtues and specially open of hand, while after his imperial marriage he was fallen into

* We get several notices of Constantius among the fragments of Olympiodôros. In one (467) we read that Ἰλλυριὸς ἦν τὸ γένος ἀπὸ Ναΐσου πόλεως τῆς Δακίας, καὶ πολλὰς στρατείας ἀπὸ τῶν Θεοδοσίου χρόνων τοῦ μεγάλου διελθών. See also 450, 457.

† He is brought in by Sôzomen (ix. 13) as Κωνστάντιος ὁ τοῦ Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ πατήρ, and by Olympiodôros (450) as Κωνστάντιος ὃς ἠγάγετο Πλακιδίαν.

covetousness, and greediness he loved withal *. It was looked on as a deed of justice rather than of cruelty when, at some stage of his career, he caused Olympios, the slanderer of Stilicho, to lose his ears and to be beaten to death with clubs †. We have his personal picture, a picture perhaps not altogether attractive. We can see him with his wide head, his long neck, his large eyes, looking sad and stern as he went forth in warlike array, leaning forward on the neck of his horse, and turning his eyes hither and thither. Men who saw him in such guise said that he bore on him the stamp of one who should one day be a tyrant, a danger which was escaped by his admission among the ranks of lawful princes. But those who saw him in his lighter hours thought otherwise. At the table and at the banquet of wine, he was ever cheerful and bore himself as the equal of his companions. He would rise and take his part in merry strife with the jesters who were brought in

* Olympiodôros, 467; *Ἦν τἆλλα μὲν ἐπαινετὸς καὶ χρημάτων δὲ κρείσσων, πρὶν ἢ συναφθῆναι Πλακιδίᾳ, ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτῇ συνέζευκτο, εἰς φιλοχρηματίαν ἐξώκειλε.* This, bating the special metaphor, is almost translated in the words of the Peterborough Chronicle, 1087; "He wæs on gitsunge befeallan, and grædinesse he lufode mid ealle.'

† This story is told by Olympiodôros (450), but it is not easy to fix the date, and it must have been after our time, after his marriage with Placidia. Olympios lost his power, as is described by Zôsimos, v. 46, but rose to power again, and on his second fall, was thus dealt with by Constantius; *ἐξέπεσε τῆς ἀρχῆς. εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέβη ταύτης, εἶτα ἐκπεσών, ῥοπάλοις ὕστερον ὑπὸ Κωνσταντίου ὃς ἠγάγετο Πλακιδίαν παιόμενος ἀναιρεῖται, τὰς ἀκοὰς πρότερον ἐκκοπείς.* He adds the moral comment; *καὶ ἡ δίκη τὸν ἀνοσιουργὸν εἰς τέλος οὐκ ἀφῆκεν ἀτιμώρητον.*

for the common amusement*. Such he was in the hours of peace at Ravenna; at Arles he showed himself in his sterner aspect. He set forth on his errand, taking with him as his second in command a valiant Goth who bore the renowned name of Wulfilas†, a name whose chief renown has been won in other fields than those of warfare.

Constantius and Wulfilas were sent against Constantine; it is not clear whether they expected to meet with any other enemy. From what point they approached Arles would depend on the road by which they left Italy. They might take either side of the Little Alps and the Durance; they might or might not pass by Glanum on its plain among the hills, with its arch and its still abiding monument. But we may best conceive them skirting the roots of Mount of Victory, with Gaius Marius as passing through the city of Sextius with its health-giving waters, as pressing on by the Stony Plain, thick with the artillery which Zeus himself hurled down to the

* This curious picture, which has not been neglected either by Gibbon (ch. xxxi.) or Hodgkin (i. 823), comes from Olympiodôros, 457; *ἦν δὲ Κωνστάντιος ἐν μὲν ταῖς προόδοις κατηφὴς καὶ σκυθρωπὸς, μεγαλόφθαλμός τε καὶ μεγαλαύχην καὶ πλατυκέφαλος, νεύων δ' ὅλου ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τοῦ φέροντος αὐτὸν ἵππου, καὶ οὕτω τῇδε κακεῖσε λοξὸν ἐκπέμπων τὸ ὄμμα, ὡς, τὸ τοῦ λόγου, πᾶσι φαίνεσθαι εἶδος ἄξιον τυραννίδος, ἐν δὲ δείπνοις καὶ συμποσίοις τερπνὸς καὶ πολιτικὸς, ὡς καὶ ἐρίζειν τοῖς μίμοις πολλάκις παίζουσι πρὸ τῆς τραπέζης.*

† "Per Honorii duces Constantium et Ulphulam," says Prosper, 411. So Olymp. 453; *ἐν ᾧ δὲ ταῦτα ἐγίνετο* [while Gerontius entered Gaul] *Κωνστάντιος καὶ Οὐλφιλᾶς ἀποστέλλονται παρὰ Ὀνωρίου κατα Κωνσταντίνου.* Sôzomen (ix. 13) does not mention Wulfilas now, but in his next chapter as *Οὐλφίλας ὁ Κωνσταντίου συστρατηγός.*

help of his valiant son*, and which the traveller who threads the streets of Arles might wish that he was not so often called on to trample underfoot. In either case the last stage of their journey would be the same; they would draw near the city from the north-east; their approach would immediately threaten the Gaulish Gate with the palace of the two Constantines rising to their right, while the huge mass of the amphitheatre, taken with the city and taught, like the lesser amphitheatre of Rome, to form part of its defences, rose in its vast bulk yet more proudly to their left. We would fain know whether it came on them as a surprise to find that they had to deal with two enemies within and without the city. It was a strange errand on which the army of Constantius had come. Their march had led them to a besieged town; but they did not come to relieve it; their object was not to deliver but to capture; only they were for a moment hindered from capturing because yet another power had stepped in before them to besiege. As the troops of Gerontius had come from the direct north, their last stage must have been the same as the last stage of the march of Constantius. The army of Italy must have found the army of Spain actually encamped before the very gate by which either of the roads one of which they must have taken would lead them to the walls. Here there was an enemy to be dislodged before they could throw up a bank or shoot an arrow against the city itself. Those who

* Le Crau; see Strabo, iv. 1. 7, and the fragment of Æschylus' Prometheus Invinctus there cited; Dindorf. No. 182.

attacked and those who defended Arles were alike traitors to the lawful Emperor whom they served. Constantine the tyrant was within; Gerontius the general of Maximus the tyrant was without. If they would discharge the errand on which they had been sent, themselves to besiege Arles and to arrest its Emperor, they had first to deal with those who had come out of Spain on the like errand. The work was not a hard one. It may be that the soldiers of Gerontius were in some way moved by the thought that the army of Constantius was the army of a lawful and undisputed Emperor. It is certain that Gerontius had, by the sternness of his discipline, kindled disaffection in his own ranks. The greater part of his forces forsook him and followed the banners of Constantius. He himself with a small party escaped into Spain*. We must presently follow him thither to listen to the thrilling tale of his last hours; for the present there is more serious work among the streams and the lagunes of Arles.

By the flight of Gerontius and his few companions the army of Italy, the army of Constantius, had taken the place of the army of Spain as the host to whose lot it fell to besiege Constantine in Arles.

* It is Sôzomen (ix. 13) who here gives the fullest and clearest account; Γερόντιος . . . φεύγει παραχρῆμα μετ' ὀλίγων στρατιωτῶν· οἱ γὰρ πλείους τοῖς ἀμφὶ τὸν Κωνστάντιον προσεχώρησαν. Olympiodôros (454) is less clear, but he gives us the reason for the desertion of the troops of Gerontius; Γερόντιος, παραγενομένων Οὐλφιλᾶ καὶ Κωνσταντίου, φεύγει. καὶ καταληφθεὶς, ὅτι ἐγκρατῶς ἦρχε τοῦ οἰκείου στρατοῦ, ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐκείνων ἐπιβουλεύεται. We should hardly find out from this that he got back to Spain, but that he did so is plain from the words which next follow in Sôzomen.

Through the defection of so great a part of the soldiers of Gerontius, the two besieging armies must have been largely made up of the same men. Meanwhile it will be remembered that the Frankish Edobich, now, at all events, the best officer in the service of Constantine, had gone beyond the Rhine to seek for allies for his master among Franks and Alamans. His mission was not in vain. Arles did not yield in a moment. Warfare beneath its walls lasted longer than it had lasted beneath the walls of Valence or seemingly beneath those of Vienne. The siege was already in its fourth month (411) when the news came that Edobich was drawing near with a vast and motley host of barbarians to the relief of Constantine*. Constantius and Wulfilas were troubled

* I have here ventured to take a date from Renatus and a fact from other writers. In the extracts made by Gregory (ii. 9) from Renatus, Edobich goes to collect Frankish and Alamannian allies, and we hear no more of him. But "vix dum quartus obsidionis Constantini mensis agebatur," not Edobich, but Jovinus, who has already assumed Empire, comes with a vast barbarian host, and then Constantine is given up and sent into Italy. Sôzomen, on the other hand, records the mission of Edobich and its issue. He comes back with the troops he has gathered, fights Constantius, and dies as in the text. Then Constantine abdicates. Sôzomen then mentions the overthrow of Jovinus, but without mentioning the time of his usurpation.

It seems to me that, as far as the whole campaign of Constantius is concerned, Sôzomen gives a coherent and probable account. Renatus may have done the same, if we had his full text; but we have only the account that we can put together out of fragments quoted from him by Gregory. What becomes of Edobich? The march of Jovinus is not mentioned elsewhere. Why should Constantine or the defenders of Arles surrender—seemingly to Constantius

at the tidings; for a moment they even, like Sarus, made up their minds to leave Gaul and await the enemy in Italy. But the march of Edobich was too

—because of the coming of Jovinus? Why did not Constantius stay to fight Jovinus? But if we accept Sôzomen's version, the whole is clear. With the failure of Edobich, Constantine's hopes of relief are at an end, and he surrenders. The work of Constantius, in Gaul at least, is done; the usurpation of Jovinus, we must suppose, comes later. Is it not most likely that there is some confusion in Gregory's extracts from Renatus, and that the host which came in the fourth month of the siege was really that of Edobich and not that of Jovinus? Gregory does not always copy things accurately, as we may see by his quotations from Sidonius, where we can test him. The withdrawal of Constantius, the quiet surrender of Gaul to Jovinus, which Renatus, as we have him, implied, have naturally puzzled both Gibbon and Wietersheim.

No one but Renatus seems to put the usurpation of Jovinus before the fall of Constantine. Orosius does not follow strict chronological order, for he mentions the death of Constans and adds "in ejus locum [Gerontius] Maximum quemdam substituit." But when he has got rid of Maximus, he says emphatically, "Jovinus *postea* vir Galliarum nobilissimus in tyrannidem mox ut assurrexit, cecidit." Prosper Tiro (whatever he is worth) places the fall of Constantine in 411, and the usurpation of Jovinus ("tyrannidem *post Constantium* invadit") in 413, the same year as his overthrow. Marcellinus kills Constantine in 411, and in 412 has "Jovinus et Sebastianus in Galliis tyrannidem molientes occisi sunt." The higher authority of Prosper places the fall of Constantine in 411, and in 413 has "Jovinus et Sebastianus fratres in Galliis regno arrepto interempti." In all these there is no very distinct or trustworthy statement of the date of the usurpation of Jovinus. The casual mention in Prosper and Marcellinus, though suggesting a later date than that of Renatus, does not amount to a direct statement. Idatius alone is explicit, and I think decisive, on the whole matter;

speedy to allow this timid scheme to be carried out. The besiegers of Arles were on the left, the eastern, side of the Rhone; Edobich seems to have been marching southward along the western bank. When the news came that he was actually encamped in their near neighbourhood, on the peninsula that is covered by the Julian Colony, the furthest point to the north-east of the dreary region of the Camargue, all thoughts of retreat were cast aside by the generals of Honorius. They determined to face the enemy boldly. They crossed the river to give battle to the new comers. Both this fact, and the scheme of action that was planned between the Roman and the Gothic commander, a scheme which showed no lack either of skill or of daring, seem to show that the host of Edobich could hardly have reached even the wall of the Colony, and that the battle must have been fought at some little distance from Arles itself*. For the followers of Edobich, unlike the

"xvii [411] Constantinus post triennium invasæ tyrannidis ab Honorii duce Constantio intra Gallias occiditur.

xviii [412] Jovinus et Sebastianus fratres intra Galliam, et in Africa Heraclianus pari tyrannidis inflantur insania.

xix [413] Jovinus et Sebastianus oppressi ab Honorii ducibus Narbona interfecti sunt."

I cannot think that the authority of this very clear statement is weakened by the inaccuracy of placing the death of Constantine (whom he had not mentioned before), as well as his reign and overthrow, "intra Gallias." I hold therefore that Jovinus did not set himself up till after the death of Constantine, and that the army of Jovinus spoken of in Gregory is really the army of Edobich whose fate is described by Sozomen.

* I think I see something like this change of purpose in the not

followers of Gerontius, did meet the army of Constantius in open fight. According to the plan arranged between him and Wulfilas, Constantius himself*, at the head of the infantry, awaited the attack of the enemy. Wulfilas, with the horse, seemingly a small body, lurked in ambush at no great distance. The host of Edobich, eager for battle, marched by the hidden foes without suspecting their presence, and met the troops of Constantius face to face. At a given signal Wulfilas and his horsemen dashed out of their lurking-place and charged straight on the rear of the enemy. The battle was at once decided; the barbarian host was broken; some fled; some were slain; the more part threw down their arms, craved for mercy, and received it†. Edobich fled; he had, in old Teutonic guise, like Englishmen ages after, waged the actual battle on foot; the horse was but a means to take the warrior to and from the field. When the day

very emphatic language of Sôzomen (ix. 14). Edobich is said to be coming, *τοῦτο δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ὀνωρίου στρατηγοὺς οὐ μετρίως ἐφόβει. βουλευσαμένων τε αὐτῶν ἀναστρέφειν εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν, κἀκεῖ πειραθῆναι τοῦ πολέμου, καὶ ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο συνεδόκει, πλησίον ἀγγελθέντος Ἐδοβίχου, περῶσι Ῥοδανὸν τὸν ποταμόν. καὶ Κωνστάντιος μὲν ἔχων τοὺς πεζοὺς, ἐπιόντας περιμένει τοὺς πολεμίους· Οὐλφιλᾶς δὲ ὁ Κωνσταντίου συστρατηγὸς, οὐ πόρρωθεν ἀποκρυβεὶς μετὰ τῶν ἱππέων ἐλάνθανεν.* They must have crossed the Rhone in order to bring on a battle now the enemy was actually hard by. As Arles lies on the eastern side of the river, the enemy must have been on the western.

* Constantius, we must remember, was, according to Sôzomen (ix. 16), *ἀνὴρ μαχιμώτατος καὶ στρατηγικός.*

† *αὐτίκα τε τροπῆς γενομένης, οἱ μὲν φεύγουσιν, οἱ δ' ἀναιροῦνται, οἱ δὲ πλείους τὰ ὅπλα ἀποθέμενοι, συγγνώμην ἤτησαν καὶ φειδοῦς ἠξιώθησαν.*

was lost, like the traitors at Maldon or the vanquished remnant on Senlac, he mounted a horse and rode for his life*. Not far from the place of battle was the country-house of one Ecdicius, a man whom Edobich deemed a friend, one to whom he had in former days done many good offices. With him he sought shelter. But in the mind of Ecdicius there was no place for the thought either of hospitality or of thankfulness. He smote off the head of the benefactor who craved his help, and carried it to the camp of Constantius in hope of a reward. The general who could strive for mastery with professional buffoons was ready with a grim joke. He took the head and said that for the deed of Wulfilas the republic owed its thanks to Ecdicius†. But when the murderer showed signs of wishing to stay in his company, Constantius bade him begone; the presence of one who had so evil entreated his guest was not good for him or for his army‡.

* Ἐδόβιχος δὲ ἵππου ἐπιβὰς ἔφυγεν. This is exactly the last scene of the Bayeux Tapestry; only there it was not the chief who fled.

† Κωνστάντιος δὲ τὴν μὲν κεφαλὴν δεχθῆναι προσέταξε, χάριν ἔχειν Ἐκδικίῳ τὸ δημόσιον εἰπὼν τῆς Οὐλφίλα πράξεως. The jest is a little hard to follow, though a jest seems to be meant, but it is hardly needful to transpose the two proper names, as was suggested by Valois. The word δημόσιον is of more importance, as it clearly translates *res publica*, the name constantly applied to the Empire long after this time, and which is sometimes a little startling in the mouths of those who were not its subjects. Its use seems also to show that we have a literal translation of the actual words of Constantius.

‡ συνεῖναι δὲ σπουδάζοντα αὐτὸν ἀναχωρεῖν ἐκέλευσεν, οὐκ ἀγαθὴν ἡγησάμενος κακοῦ ξενοδόχου τὴν συνουσίαν ἔσεσθαι αὐτῷ ἢ τῇ στρατιᾷ.

And so the man who slew his friend in the day of danger was sent away empty by the man who refused to reward crime even when he gained by it*.

The overthrow and death of Edobich sealed the fate of Constantine. Seeing no longer any hope of Empire, or indeed of life if he still laid claim to Empire, he put aside his diadem and purple; he betook himself to a church—already perhaps a church of Saint Trophimus—for sanctuary. He there found a bishop who perhaps deemed that in such a case he might dispense with the precept to lay hands suddenly on no man. Constans son of Constantine had of a monk become Cæsar; Constantine himself was now of an Augustus to become a Christian presbyter †. In that character he deemed that his life at least would be safe. But no great harshness was to be feared from Constantius. The defenders of the city, on receiving the general's oath for their safety and for that of their fallen prince, threw open their gates, and the people of Arles at least had no need to complain of any breach of faith on the part of the conqueror ‡. No blood was shed by

* Sôzomen seems to quote a proverb; *κατὰ κενῆς, τοῦτο δὴ τοῦ λόγου, χανὼν ἀπῆλθε.*

† Again the fullest and clearest account is that of Sôzomen (ix. 15), who alone helps us to some geography; *μετὰ τὴν νίκην ἀντιπεραιωθείσης αὖθις πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Ὀνωρίου στρατιᾶς, μαθὼν Κωνσταντῖνος ἀναιρεῖσθαι Ἐδόβιχον, αὐτὸς ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ τὴν ἀλουργίδα καὶ τὰ σύμβολα τῆς βασιλείας ἀπέθετο, καὶ καταλαβὼν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, χειροτονεῖται πρεσβύτερος.* So Olympiodôros, 453; *Κωνσταντῖνος καταφυγὼν εἰς εὐκτήριον, πρεσβύτερος τότε χειροτονεῖται.*

‡ Sôzomen, u. s.; *ὅρκους τε πρότερον λάβοντες οἱ ἔσω τειχῶν ἀνοίγουσι τὰς πύλας καὶ φειδοῦς ἀξιοῦνται πάντες.* It is from Olympiodôros that we

Constantius. But Constantine and his younger son Julian the *Nobilissimus* were sent to Ravenna to abide the judgement of Honorius. The Emperor remembered the slaughter of his kinsmen and did not hold himself bound by the oath of his general. Messengers of death were sent to meet the prisoners, and the priest Constantine and his son were beheaded at some point of their journey, either on the Mincio or at some point nearer to Ravenna *.

learn that the promise of safety was specially made to Constantine personally; *ὅρκων αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας δοθέντων, καὶ τοῖς πολιορκοῦσιν αἱ πύλαι τῆς πόλεως ἀναπετάννυνται.*

* Olympiodôros, 454; *πέμπεται σὺν τῷ υἱῷ Κωνσταντῖνος πρὸς Ὀνώριον· ὁ δὲ μνησικακῶν αὐτοῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνεψίων αὐτοῦ οὓς ἐτύγχανε Κωνσταντῖνος ἀνελὼν πρὸ τριάκοντα τῆς Ῥαβέννης μιλίων παρὰ τοὺς ὅρκους προστάττει αὐτοὺς ἀναιρεθῆναι.* The geography of Renatus (Greg. Tur. ii. 9) seems different; "Reserata urbe Constantinus deditur. Confestimque ad Italiam directus, missis a principe obviam percussoribus, super Mintiam flumen capite truncatus est." Surely no point on the Mincio can be within thirty miles of Ravenna; yet the exactness, in different ways, of both accounts is remarkable. Sôzomen does not mention the place; *Κωνσταντῖνος ἅμα Ἰουλιανῷ τῷ παιδὶ παραπεμφθεὶς εἰς Ἰταλίαν, πρὶν φθάσαι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν κτίννυται.*

It is not wonderful that writers who were not telling the story in the same detail as Sôzomen or even as Olympiodôros should have left out the sending into Italy, and have fancied that Constantine was put to death at Arles. It mattered a good deal for the characters of Constantius and Honorius; but it mattered not at all for the general course of things. So Orosius tells the whole story in a few words; "Constantius comes in Galliam cum exercitu profectus Constantinum imperatorem apud Arelatum civitatem clausit cepit et occidit." So Idatius in the passage quoted already. Prosper Tiro has simply under 411; "Constantinus tyrannus occiditur." Marcellinus puts the whole story of Constantine under 411; "Constantinus apud Gallias invasit imperium,

Just at this stage of our story we cannot complain of any lack of personal incident. We part for a moment from the meagre entries of annalists and from fragments pieced together from this source and that, to listen to such a story as the fate of Edobich and its punishment. But the stirring story of the fate of Edobich is tame compared with the thrilling tale of the fate of Gerontius. Flying, as we have seen, from Arles, he betook himself to Spain, deeming that there at least he might reign in the name of the tyrant of his own making. But his hold on the Spanish province was gone. The troops that had been left in Spain scorned the commander who had fled *. They plotted his death, and besieged him in his own house. He had with him his wife Nounechia, a few slaves, and a faithful Alan. In one version he too is a slave; in a more likely shape of the story he is an honourable companion in warfare †. The most detailed account of the death

filiumque suum ex monacho Cæsarem fecit. Ipse apud Arelatum civitates occiditur; Constans filius apud Viennam capite plectitur." Any one would think that father and son were put to death in the same interest. Prosper himself, who has recorded the revolt of Constantine in its place in 407, sums up his later story under 411; "Constantinus per Honorii duces Constantius et Ulphilam, apud Arelatum oppidum victus et captus est, cujus filium Constantem in Hispania regnare orsum Gerontius comes in Maximum quemdam tyrannidem transferens interemerat."

* Sôzomen, u. s.; *οἱ δὲ ἐν Ἱσπανίᾳ στρατιῶται εὐκαταφρόνητον ἀπὸ τῆς φυγῆς δόξαντα τὸν Γερόντιον ἐβουλεύσαντο ἀνελεῖν.*

† In Olympiodôros he is *εἷς συναγωνιστὴς Ἀλανὸς τὸ γένος, εἰς δούλους αὐτοῦ ἀριθμούμενος.* In Sôzomen he rises to the rank of *εἷς Ἀλανὸς ἐπιτήδειος.* Surely this is no slave, but a *thegn* or *θεράπων*, a *gesíð* or *δῖος ἑταῖρος.*

of Gerontius comes from an ecclesiastical historian who seems suddenly to take up a character oddly mingled between a pagan philosopher and a writer of romance. Gerontius and his few comrades, attacked by night, defend themselves from the upper stage of the house which we must conceive as a strong tower capable of offering some effective resistance. Not a few such miniature fortresses in Ireland and in the border shires of England will enable us to call up the scene. Through the embrasures of the battlements of his pele-tower, sheltered no doubt by the wooden roof coming down on the battlements, Gerontius, his Alan friend, and seemingly the slaves also, did no small execution among the assailants. Themselves almost beyond the reach of missiles, they shot at the besiegers till full three hundred of them were slain, when their stock of arrows failed them. What follows we should hardly believe if it came from a lighter source than an ecclesiastical history. It was night, and for a while the attacks of the besiegers seem to have ceased. The slaves escaped from the house; Gerontius, and therefore we may suppose, his wife and his faithful comrade, might have done the same. But Gerontius, restored to his wife, like Odysseus, after a long absence, could not bring himself, even when the lives of both were at stake, to leave a besieged tower that sheltered her. His Alan *thegn* *, his true *θεράπων*—

* The details of the story all come from Sôzomen. Olympiodôros says only, *πῦρ κατὰ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ ἀνῆψαν· ὁ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἐπαναστάντας καρτερῶς ἐμάχετο.* He then mentions the presence of the Alan. But in Sôzomen we read; *φραξάμενοι νύκτωρ αὐτοῦ*

we are hardly wrong if we use either the Teutonic word or its Greek equivalent—tarried with his lord and friend, a doomed groomsman at the renewed wedding. The day dawned, but it brought with it to Nounechia only a morning-gift of death. With the light the besiegers was again active; their weapons had failed; they now brought fire to the attack, and the three felt that there was no longer hope. But they would not fall alive into the hands of their enemies. First of all Gerontius smote off the head of the faithful Alan, who offered himself to the stroke, a *gesîð* who would not outlive his *elder*. Then the weeping Nounechia craved a last gift of the husband who was so strangely to die for love of her; let her be slain by his hand rather than pass into the power of others. She thrust herself eagerly against the weapon; Gerontius yielded to her prayer, and the faithful wife died by a stroke of the same sword wielded by the same hand that had ended the days of the Alan. Gerontius now stood alone beside the dead; the stroke of the sword failed him; he then grasped the trusty dagger that hung by his thigh, and drove it to his heart *. It might seem that

τὴν οἰκίαν κατέδραμον. ὁ δὲ μεθ' ἑνὸς Ἀλανοῦ ἐπιτηδείου καὶ ὀλίγων οἰκετῶν, ἄνωθεν τοξεύων, ὑπὲρ τοὺς τριακοσίους ἀναιρεῖ στρατιώτας· ἐπιλειψάντων δὲ τῶν βελῶν, φεύγουσιν οἱ οἰκέται, καθέντες αὐτοὺς τοῦ οἰκήματος λάθρᾳ. Γερόντιος δὲ τὸν ἴσον διασωθῆναι δυνάμενος, οὐχ εἵλετο, κατασχεθεὶς ἔρωτι Νουνιχίας τῆς αὐτοῦ γαμετῆς. If he could escape, surely she could also.

* Olympiodôros records the three deaths in a few words; *τέλος τόν τε Ἀλανὸν καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα, τοῦτο προθυμουμένους, ἀναιρεῖ, ἐπικατασφάζει δὲ καὶ ἑαυτόν.* Sôzomen enlarges; *περὶ δὲ τὴν ἕω πῦρ ἐμβαλόντων τῇ οἰκίᾳ τῶν στρατιωτῶν, οὐκ ἔχων λοιπὸν σωτηρίας ἐλπίδα, ἑκόντος τοῦ*

all these details of deeds of which no witness was left could hardly have been inferred even from a more careful examination of the dead bodies than was likely to be made when wrathful enemies at last made their way into a house which was perhaps already burning, But we must tell the tale as we find it, and specially we must not leave out the comment. Nounechia, so our ecclesiastical guide tells us, a Christian woman, died with a courage worthy of her faith, and left a memory which ought never to be forgotten *. It is for some moral *ductor dubitantium* to rule whether we have here truly a case of "homicide by necessity." The ordinary historian may keep himself to the humbler work of wondering at the minute knowledge of the guide whom he has to follow.

So, we are to believe, died Gerontius the Briton, who had helped to set up one tyrant in Gaul, and who had set up another in Spain of his own hand. His former

συνόντος αὐτῷ Ἀλανοῦ ἀποτέμνει τὴν κεφαλήν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τῆς ἰδίας γαμετῆς ὀλοφυρομένης καὶ μετὰ δακρύων προσωθούσης αὐτὴν τῷ ξίφει, καὶ πρὶν ὑφ' ἑτέροις γενέσθαι, παρὰ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀποθανεῖν αἰτούσης, καὶ τοῦτο τὸ δῶρον ὕστατον παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν ἀντιβολούσης . . . . Γερόντιος δὲ τρίτον ἑαυτὸν τῷ ξίφει παίσας, ὡς οὐ καιρίαν λαβὼν ἦσθετο, σπασάμενος τὸ περὶ τὸν μηρὸν ξιφίδιον, κατὰ τῆς καρδίας ἤλασε.

* *Ἡ μὲν γυνὴ, ἀνδρεία τῆς θρησκείας ἐπαξίως φανεῖσα (ἦν γὰρ χριστιανὴ) ὧδε τέθνηκε, κρείττονα λήθης τὴν περὶ αὐτῆς μνήμην τοῦ χρόνου παραδοῦσα.* Tillemont, 551, 561, is a good deal shocked at Sôzomen's good opinion of Nounechia. But was Gerontius a pagan? the Alan might be more likely than not. Only what were an Alan's gods?

Orosius, who does not directly tell the story, but merely brings in the fate of Gerontius in his "catalogus tyrannorum," says merely, "Gerontius a suis militibus occisus est." This was near enough to the fact for his purpose. Cf. Fauriel, i. 76.

master Constantine and his master's son had fallen with more outward show of civil justice, and their corpses were in the power of the prince in whose interest they were overthrown. According to one strange statement, the heads of Constantine and Julian, as well as the heads of other tyrants earlier and later, were sent from Italy to be set up to the public gaze at Carthage *. It is just possible that such a step may have been taken to remind the furthest parts of the dominions of Honorius of the power and the stern justice of their master. If so, the lesson was in vain. Africa, among the other dangerous growths of its soil, could send forth a tyrant as well as Britain and Spain. But for the moment the whole West, so far as it was not actually in barbarian hands, again obeyed the son of Theodosius. Honorius was undisputed Emperor; it was by his præfects and officers that the provinces were ruled †. Gaul was at rest; the corner of Spain

* This comes from a fragment of Olympiodôros (456), where he records the fate of Jovinus and Sebastian; *ἀνατίθενται ἄμφω αἱ κεφαλαὶ Καρθαγένης ἔξωθεν, ἔνθα καὶ ἡ Κωνσταντίνου καὶ ἡ Ἰουλιανοῦ ἀπετμήθησαν πρότερον*: he adds those of Maximus and Eugenius in the time of Theodosius. Mr. Hodgkin (i. 827, n.) once suggested that "Carthage" is a mistake for "Milan." If so, it is a strange one. He now believes that "Carthage" is right. Wietersheim (ii. 159) has no doubt. He calls it an "Ehrebezeugung," which reminds one of the quarrel over the quarters of David of Wales. One notices that the Latin form *Καρθαγένη* is now the received name among Greek writers for restored Carthage as for New Carthage, which Mr. Bury thinks may be here meant; *Καρχηδών* is quite an archaism.

† Sôzomen says emphatically; *τὸ ἐξ ἐκείνου πάλιν τὸ τῇδε ὑπήκοον εἰς τὴν Ὀνωρίου ἡγεμονίαν ἐπανῆλθε, καὶ τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἄρχουσιν ἐπείθετο.* This seems inconsistent with Jovinus having revolted already.

which still clave to Roman rule in some shape, submitted to its lawful wielder. Whether the presence of Constantius or of any armed force was needed, we are not directly told. But one or two things look like acts of Constantius. Maximus ceased to reign. He was forsaken by the soldiers whom Gerontius had brought from Gaul. By some authority—and whose could it have been save that of the victor of Arles?—those troops were moved first into Africa and then into Italy. They were most likely on too good terms with the barbarians of Spain, barbarians who were in formal alliance with the deposed tyrant, to be allowed to stay in the peninsula. As for Maximus himself, his personal character and conduct had been so little blameworthy that he was allowed to live. If Constantius had any hand in the matter, he had most likely learned that it was better not to trust Honorius with those whose lives he wished to save. But either Maximus still had fears, or he could not bear to live as a subject where he had reigned even in name; or it may be that absence from his former dominions was made the condition on which his life was spared. In any case he fled to his barbarian friends, he was living among them when Orosius wrote the last pages of his great homily, and there seems no reason to accept the statement of a much later writer, that, eleven years after the fall of Gerontius and Constantine (422), Maximus was sacrificed at Rome to celebrate the sixth lustrum of the reign of Honorius *.

* Olympiodôros (454), after recording the death of Gerontius, adds; Μάξιμος δὲ ὁ παῖς ταῦτα μαθὼν, πρὸς τοὺς ὑποσπόνδους φεύγει

Honorius then, four years after the revolt of Constantine, is for a moment free from Roman rivals. Barbarian may lay waste the lands of the Empire; but no tyrant lays claim to its diadem. This peaceful side of the Roman world is indeed not to last long, and there is meanwhile another side which is anything but peaceful. It is to this last side that we must now turn our eyes. Gerontius, in seizing a corner of Spain for his own creature, had betrayed the rest of the great peninsula to the Vandals, Suevians, and Alans who had made their way thither out of Gaul. It is now time to see something of their doings in the land which they had entered, doings of no small account in the history of Western Europe.

βαρβάρους, where the word *ἱποσπόνδους* (see above, p. 125, note) should be specially noticed. But both Orosius and Prosper give us some significant hints. Orosius says, "Maximus exutus purpura destitutusque a militibus Gallicanis, qui in Africam trajecti deinde in Italiam revocati sunt, nunc inter barbaros in Hispania egens exsulat." Prosper under 412 has; "Maximus in Hispania, regno ablato, vita ei concessa, eo quod modestia humilitasque hominis affectati imperii invidiam non mereretur." Idatius tells us nothing about the fate of Maximus; and there is clearly confusion of some kind in the story in Marcellinus (422), "tercennalis Honorii Maximus tyrannus et Jovinus ferro victi adducti de Hispaniis atque interfecti sunt." Yet Maximus may have come to light again during the warfare of Castinus and Boniface in that year, though that was not a warfare likely to bring prisoners to Italy.

It certainly seems to me that the notices in Orosius and Prosper suggest some such explanation as I have hinted at in the text.

IV.

[THE BARBARIAN INVADERS.]

In our view of the years with which we are now dealing, we have to look at a great drama, two acts of which are going on at the same time, ever influencing one another, but still distinct from one another in idea. We watch the rise and fall of the successive candidates for the Empire of Rome, the tyrants who spring to power for a moment only to yield to the strangely abiding luck of a prince who must in every personal gift have been the inferior of any of them. We watch too with a deeper interest the events which had a more direct effect on the later history of the world, the movements of the barbarian nations, and their settlements within the lands of the Empire. Specially we watch the movements and settlements of those nations which were of our own kindred; above all we trace, whenever we are allowed, as we are now and then in passing, the earliest fortunes of our own people. The two scenes of action, the doings of the tyrants and the doings of the barbarians, cannot be kept asunder. Here the barbarian sets up tyrants and puts them down as suits his purposes. Here the tyrant calls in the barbarians as suits his purposes; but finds it less easy to send away

the barbarian whom he has called in than the barbarian finds it to put down the tyrant whom he has set up. There is no side of the affairs of the Empire, no quarter in which those affairs are acted, which does not influence some other side and some other quarter. In our present inquiry the matter and the quarter which seem least directly to concern us are the most striking of events, the most attractive of lands—Italy and her fate during the campaigns of Alaric. While our own story is going on in the narrower fields of Trier or Arles or Tarragona, we must never forget, as we are sometimes tempted to forget, that greater deeds, as we commonly measure the greatness of deeds, were doing on the wider field of Rome. Yet we must remember also that it was the march of Alaric into Italy which was the beginning of our whole story; it was that march which led to the barbarian invasion of Gaul, to the crossing of Constantine from Britain, and to all that followed on that invasion and that crossing. And now we must remember again that, before Constantine surrendered to Constantius, before Constantius set forth for Arles, Alaric no longer led the West-Goths. The accession of Atawulf had changed the whole relations of Romans and barbarians in Italy; it was about to change them in Gaul and Spain. In 411 Honorius could act as he could not have acted in 410; when Rome was sacked, Arles was safe, at least against Honorius. And under Atawulf his people put out a wholly new aspect in our own story. Hitherto it has been only incidentally that we have had to speak of the Goths and their movements. They will soon become the chief

actors in our tale. But for them we have to wait another year, and we have also a gap, hardly a gap of a full year (411–412), during which the throne of Honorius was not disturbed by the revolt of a single tyrant. We have therefore a moment to look at one act of our drama by itself. We can now see, as far as our lights will let us, how things fared with the native inhabitants, with the barbarian invaders, of Gaul, Spain, and Britain, at the moment when Constantine had fallen, when Jovinus had not yet arisen, and when Atawulf had not made his way into Gaul. But it is an inquiry which will lead us far beyond the moment of our first glimpse, and that above all, in matters which may now and then concern our own people, and which specially concern the land to whose winning our own people were drawing nearer day by day.

We said just now that Maximus, when his life was spared, most likely by the mercy of Constantius, fled to the barbarians. To fly to the barbarians was just now an easy matter, either for deposed Emperors or for other men. In Spain it was easiest of all. We have seen that, five years before this time (406–407), the great combined host of Vandals, Suevians, and Alans had entered Gaul, and that, two years before this time (409), they had made their way into Spain. The civil wars of the contending Roman princes are handed down to us in detail, while our notices of the movements of the barbarians are so grievously vague, that it needs an effort to take in how small a part of both Gaul and Spain was touched by the dis-

puted claims of Honorius, Constantine, and Maximus, in other words how small a part of either land was left to the obedience of Rome in any shape. We are tempted to fancy that victory or defeat carried with it the dominion of the whole land, while in truth the whole story is confined to a corner of Gaul and a corner of Spain, while the greater part of both lands were dealt with as the invaders thought good. There is something not a little strange in the sight of rival princes thus struggling with one another for these shreds of Empire, while the common enemy tears away land after land from the dominion of any of them. Yet such are the facts with which we have to deal, facts which are far from standing alone, but which have no lack of parallels both in earlier and in later times. The enemy who was laying waste whole provinces was never looked on as a common enemy; each disputant found it better suited his purpose to use him as an ally against the more immediate enemy among his own people. Constantine, as we have seen, clearly had some understanding with the ravagers of Gaul*; Gerontius, yet more clearly, had an understanding with the same enemies. They fought in his armies; among them, as among pledged allies, we have just seen that Maximus found shelter. It was indeed the understanding between Gerontius and the barbarians which gave Gaul a temporary relief and the Roman power in Gaul a chance of temporary revival. But it gave them only at the cost of the endurance by Spain of the horrors from which Gaul had been set

* See above, p. 97 and note.

free, and of the sudden and final overthrow of the Roman power in the greater part of the peninsula. In concert with Gerontius, Vandals, Alans, Suevians left the wasted lands of Gaul to seek fresh prey and this time fresh homes in the untouched lands of Spain. In Gaul they had simply ravaged; in Spain they sat down and dwelled.

Of this great revolution we have hardly anything that can be called a narrative. Of the course which the invasion took we know less than we know of the invasion of Gaul just before. Of that we do know the main geographical outlines and the special fate of this and that city. Here, till the partition and settlement a little later, we get no geography at all; but our chronology is as minute as it was when the same invaders first entered Gaul. Some passed the mountain border on the 28th day of September, others on the 13th day of October, in the year of the eighth consulship of Honorius and the third of Theodosius (409) *. The passes of the Pyrenees had, it will be remembered, been left open to them by the

* It was the Gaulish Prosper who gave us the exact date for the crossing of the Rhine, it is no less fittingly the Spaniard Idatius who gives us the exact date for the crossing of the Pyrenees; "Alani et Wandali et Suevi Hispanias ingressi æra ccccxlvii, alii quarto kalendas, alii tertio idus Octobris memorant die, tertia feria, Honorio viii et Theodosio Arcadii filio iii consulibus." Prosper tells us only, "Vandali Hispanias occupaverunt." Isidore, in his Chronicle (Roncalli, ii. 434), makes a synchronism which it is well to remember; "Gotthi Romam capiunt, Wandali quoque et Alani et Suevi Hispanias occupant." Cassiodorus has only "His coss. Wandali Hispanias occupaverunt." Count Marcellinus did not think matters so far west worth recording.

removal of their native Spanish defenders*. The Honorian troops who had taken their places, instead of offering them any opposition, joined themselves to the new comers†. But we are told nothing as to the particular points where they entered, as to the course which any of them took, or as to the fate of particular cities. We know the name of one only among their leaders, Ermeric chief of the Suevians‡. But of their doings we have more than one vivid general picture, and that from contemporaries and natives of the suffering land. While we thank them for telling us thus much, we feel a kind of grudge against them for not giving us all the details which they must have had in their memories. In the few months that were left of the year of their entry a plague arose from which the invaders who were

* See above, p. 67, note. It is now that Isidore in the Historia Wandalorum brings in the kinsfolk of Honorius a little before their time.

† So Orosius; "Igitur Honoriaci imbuti præda et allecti abundantia, quo magis scelus impunitum foret atque ipsis sceleris plus liceret, prodita Pyrenæi custodia claustrisque patefactis cunctas gentes quæ per Gallias vagabantur Hispaniarum provinciis immittunt, iisdemque ipsi adjunguntur; ubi actis aliquamdiu magnis cruentisque discursibus post graves rerum atque hominum vastationes, quantum ipsos quoquo modo pœnitet, habita sorte et distributa usque ad nunc possessione consistunt."

‡ Isidore begins his "Historia Suevorum" with the words, "Suevi principe Ermerico cum Alanis et Wandalis simul Spanias ingressi sunt." He goes on to describe his reign of thirty-two years. Wietersheim (ii. 138) remarks that Procopius is mistaken when he says (Bell. Vand. i. 3); Βανδίλοι . . . ἡγουμένου αὐτοῖς Γοδεγίσκλου, ἐν Ἱσπανίᾳ ἱδρύσαντο, as Godegisel was killed on the other side of the Rhine. See above.

slaughtering far and wide doubtless suffered at least as severely as the natives *. Some resistance they seem to have met with; at least we are told that the substance of the cities was swallowed up by soldiers and tyrannical tax-gatherers †. The soldiers must be soldiers of Rome, paid to offer some front to the invaders, and the tax-gatherers are assuredly the officers of Rome, busy after the soldiers' pay and all that came out of the purses of the provincials. Hunger followed in the wake of the sword and the pestilence; men ate their fellow-men; even mothers ate their children. The beasts of the field, grown bold by feasting on the dead, presently made victims of the living. The four sore judgements of the Lord announced by his prophets, all fell on the devoted land ‡. Yet were there some small softenings of the general horror. The whole land was not laid waste at once; those who were persecuted in one city could sometimes flee to another; the invaders gradually grew milder; they who might have slain

* So Idatius; "Barbari qui in Hispanias ingressi fuerant, cæde deprædantur hostili. Pestilentia suas partes non segnius operatur."

† Ib. "Debacchantibus per Hispanias barbaris, et sæviente nihilominus pestilentiæ malo, opes et conditam in urbibus substantiam tyrannicus exactor diruit et miles exhaurit."

‡ Ib. "Fames dira grassatur, adeo ut humanæ carnes ab humano genere vi famis fuerint devoratæ: matres quoque necatis vel coctis per se natorum suorum sint pastæ corporibus. Bestiæ occisorum gladio, fame, pestilentia, cadaveribus assuetæ, quosque hominum fortiores interimunt, eorumque carnibus pastæ passim in humani generis efferantur interitum. Et ita *quatuor plagis ferri, famis, pestilentiæ, bestiarum,* ubique in toto orbe sævientibus, prædictæ a Domino per prophetas suos annuntiationes implentur."

all and carried off the goods of all, would sometimes stoop to take a hireling's wages, to defend, to serve, even to bow their shoulders to the carrying of burthens *. Before two years were ended, God moved the hearts of the invaders to occupy the land instead of wasting it. The wandering hosts settled down and became nations dwelling under their kings on the conquered soil †.

The two sides of the character of the invaders of Spain, as described by natives of Spain recording what they had themselves seen, form a striking contrast, but not an unnatural one. The kind of life which men led during the Wandering of the Nations was likely to bring out very opposite sides of human nature. Quite distinct from the refined delight in actual cruelty which belongs rather to a more advanced and scientific stage of man's training, there seems to be lurking in at least many of us, not only a general love of excitement, but a certain love of mere havoc which often comes out even in highly

* The less dark part of the story, though not left out by Idatius, comes out most strongly in Orosius; "Quæ cum ita sint, illud tantum clementia Dei eadem pietate qua dudum prædixerat procuravit ut secundum evangelium suum quo incessabiliter commonebat; *cum vos persecuti fuerint in una civitate, fugite in aliam*, quisque egrediens quo abire vellet ipsis barbaris mercenariis ministris ac defensoribus uteretur. Hoc tunc ipsi offerebant. Et qui auferre omnia interfectis omnibus poterant particulam stipendii ob mercedem servitii sui et transvecti oneris flagitabant."

† Idatius, xvii. Hon.; "subversis memorata plagarum grassatione Hispaniæ provinciis, barbari ad pacem ineundam, Domino miserante, conversi, sorte ad inhabitandum sibi provinciarum dividunt regiones." Orosius speaks of "biennium illud quo hostilis gladius sævit."

civilized societies whenever the restraints of law and usage are broken through. The rough dealings of a barbarian invader with men and things in the invaded land have nothing in common with the prolonged and carefully studied cruelties of a Visconti. Salvianus, in summing up the vices and virtues of the barbarians, sets down mere cruelty as the characteristic vice of one nation only, though that, we are sorry to say, is the nation in whose reputation we are most nearly concerned*. In speaking of cruelty as the marked fault of the Saxons, Salvianus is but forestalling the more detailed witness of Sidonius. And we may mark the notable distinction which the stern prophet draws between the Teutonic invaders of the Empire and those invaders of wilder nations who were stirring in the world at the same time. It is not likely that Salvianus troubled himself much with ethnological theories. He might very likely not notice that the Goth and the Frank, he would assuredly not notice that the Goth and the Roman, came immeasureably nearer to one another in speech and in all that goes to make nationality, than any of them did to the Hun. The European, who had in him the power

* This comes from Salvian's (vii. 15) balance of the virtues and vices of the several barbarian nations; "Gothorum quis perfida est, sed pudica; Alanorum impudica sed minus perfida; Franci mendaces sed hospitales; Saxones crudelitate efferi, sed castitate mirandi; omnes denique gentes habent, sicut peculiaria mala, ita etiam quædam bona." The Romans of Africa had no good thing found in them. On Saxon cruelty, see the well-known description of Sidonius [speaking of their sacrificial slaughter of their captives].

of rising to the highest level, already marked his superiority over those intruders from Asia whom we may call barbarians from the Teutonic as well as from the Roman point of view. They showed it specially in those matters in which the early society of Teutonic Europe has always kept its superiority over the early society of Africa and Asia. All the nations had their several faults. If the Saxon had his cruelty, the Frank and, we are surprised to hear, the Goth, had his faithlessness. But the strict chastity of all the Teutonic nations is loudly praised. It is praised chiefly in opposition to the corrupt manners of the Romans in general, and specially to those of Aquitaine and Africa*. But it stands in hardly less marked contrast to the manners of those invaders who had no share even in the remoter fellowship of Goth and Roman. The Vandals who burst into Spain were conspicuous for their chastity; not so the Alans, not so the Huns. The Alans too he brands with a special mark as greedy plunderers, while he lays no such blame on the Vandals, whom he acquits also of that extortion and oppression of the poor which he sets down as one of the worst sins of Roman rule†. Of

* The people of Africa, and specially those of Carthage, are rebuked, or rather reviled, through nearly the whole of Salvian's treatise. The Aquitanians come in for several hard thrusts, specially at vii. 3.

† Salvian (v. 8) first sets forth the oppression of the poor which accompanied the Roman system of taxation, and then asks; "Ubi aut in quibus sunt nisi in Romanis tantum hæc mala? quorum injustitia tanta nisi nostra? Franci enim hoc scelus nesciunt: Chuni ab his sceleribus immunes sunt: nihil horum est apud Wandalos, nihil horum apud Gothos. Tam longe enim est ut hæc

the third people who now entered Spain, the Suevians; Salvianus gives us no picture. Something must always be taken away from his rhetoric on both sides. We need not believe that the Romans were quite so bad, neither dare we flatter ourselves that the Teutonic settlers were quite so good, as they appear in the pages of one who had a strong temptation to exaggerate on both sides. But there must be a groundwork of truth in both pictures. We may believe that even barbarian conquest was not wholly without its less dark side. We must remember the strange contradictions of man's nature. Ravage, plunder, even slaughter, done among the whirl of feelings which must accompany the armed entry into a strange land, are really not inconsistent with much true kindliness of heart lurking below. With men who are not in the habit of either subduing or disguising any of their emotions, the fiercer and the gentler feelings come to the front in a strange kind of alternation. We are therefore not surprised to read, though we take off a little from rhetoric which is not without a purpose, how before long the invaders beat their swords into plough-shares, how they dealt with the Roman remnant as allies and friends, how not a few Romans of the still untouched lands chose rather to go and enjoy freedom, though along with poverty, among the bar-

inter Gothos barbari tolerent ut ne Romani quidem qui inter eos vivunt ista patiantur." It must not be forgotten that systematic taxation is a characteristic of civilized society, and that therefore neither its uses nor its abuses were likely to be found among the barbarians.

barians, rather than to suffer the cares and exactions which fell on a dweller within what was left of the Roman dominion*. That dominion had now shrunk up into the north-eastern corner of the peninsula. The rest was parted out among the new comers. The Suevians and one branch of the Vandals established themselves in the north-western corner, the land of Gallicia. Another branch of the Vandals, the Silingi, established themselves in the extreme south, in Bœtica, a land whose later name of Andalusia has been thought by some to be a witness of their sojourn. The central lands of Lusitania and the province of New Carthage fell to the lot of

* After the passage last quoted Salvian goes on; "Itaque unum illic Romanorum omnium votum est ne umquam eos necesse sit in jus transire Romanum. Una et consentionis illic Romanæ plebis oratio ut liceat eis vitam quam agunt agere cum barbaris. Et miramur si non vincuntur a nostris partibus Gothi, cum malint apud hos esse quam apud nos Romani. Itaque non solum transfugere ab eis ad nos fratres nostri omnino nolunt, sed ut ad eos confugiant nos relinquunt." He had said before in the fifth chapter of the same book; "Quamvis ab his ad quos confugiunt discrepent ritu, discrepent lingua, ipsa etiam, ut ita dicam, corporum atque induviarum barbaricarum fœtore dissentiant, malunt tamen in barbaris pati cultum dissimilem quam in Romanis injustitiam sævientem. Itaque passim vel ad Gothos vel ad Bacaudas vel ad alios ubique dominantes barbaros migrant, et commigrasse non pœnitet: malunt enim sub specie captivitatis vivere liberi quam sub specie libertatis esse captivi." One hardly expected to find the "Bacaudæ," who surely were Gaulish provincials, reckoned among barbarians. Orosius speaks in the like sort; "Continuo barbari exsecrati gladios suos ad aratra conversi sunt, residuosque Romanos ut socios modo et amicos fovent, ut inveniantur inter eos quidam Romani qui malint inter barbaros pauperem libertatem quam inter Romanos tributariam sollicitudinem sustinere."

Alans, who thus for a moment held a dominion stretching from the Mediterranean to the Ocean *. Of these kingdoms that of the Suevians was the most abiding. A Suevian power, with very fluctuating boundaries, lasted in Spain for more than two hundred years. The West-Gothic sword, wielded in the name of Rome, before long made short work of the rest. The Alans and the northern Vandals vanish from history. The southern Vandals cross the strait to become more famous in Africa. The Teutonic power which was to be really abiding in the land, which was to hand on to the later life of Spain whatever of Teutonic elements are to be found in it, was neither the Suevian nor the Vandal, but the West-Goth.

But we have also again to look at the other lands of the West, in one of which the West-Goth is presently to play a memorable, though a less abiding, part than he played in Spain. The war between Gerontius and Constantine led, in some way which it is not easy to understand in detail, to the final separation of Britain from the Roman dominion and to a separation, if at first only partial and for a season, of that part of Gaul which before long began to share the British name. The two events go together; the fates of the elder Britain in the island and of the

* The geography is given by Idatius; "Gallæciam Wandali occupant et Suevi, sitam in extremitate oceani maris occidua. Alani Lusitaniam et Carthaginiensem provincias, et Wandali cognomine Silingi Bœticum sortiuutur. Hispani per civitates et castella residui a plagis barbarorum per provincias dominantium se subjiciunt servituti."

younger Britain on the mainland cannot be kept asunder. And the importance of the fates of both is of the highest. On the fate of the island at this moment nothing short of the future calling of our own people turns. Were Angles and Saxons simply to be as Goths and Franks or to be something wholly different? We were about to take possession of a new home; it was of the utmost moment to our future life in what state we found that home. Of all historic losses, the cruellest is that which has forbidden us to instruct ourselves by any continuous history of Britain in the fifth century. It is not that such a treasure once was and has perished. We may be sure that nothing of the kind ever was, that nothing of the kind ever could be. But the fact that no history of Britain in those times ever was or ever could be is itself the most instructive of all facts. Our ignorance does in truth teach us better than any amount of knowledge could. We mourn that, so far from having a Sidonius or a Gregory for Britain, we have not even a Prosper or an Idatius. But the fact that we have neither sets before us the difference between the fate of Britain and the fate of other lands better than it could be set before us by the minutest knowledge of events. As for the lesser Britain which now began to arise in Gaul, it has not had the same influence on the world's history as the Greater; yet it plays a memorable part in the history of Gaul from this age onwards; and its very being is one of the most signal phænomena of history. A survival of a people, say of Wends, of Lithuanians, of older Basques, is always attractive. But the Celtic

corner of Gaul is more than the survival of a people. It is the unique phænomenon of a speech and a nationality which must have been at least decaying being suddenly quickened and strengthened, while its fellows were dying out around it, being called up to an abiding life and to some measure of importance in the world, by the settlement of colonists of a kindred stock, and those not hopeful settlers sent forth from a flourishing metropolis, but for the most part men flying from an invaded land to seek other homes for themselves. Here then we have one of the great facts of the world's history, coupled with a lesser fact of singular interest in its own way. Only we have to grope after such meagre knowledge as we can reach to about Britain either through a cloud of thick darkness such as shrouds no other part even of the tale, in other parts often dark enough, which we have undertaken to spell out. The island of Britain parted from the dominion of Rome, and a new Britain arose in a corner of Gaul. These are our main facts; at the details we may guess for ever.

Truly our knowledge of these events has to be put together from the most meagre and most provoking of authorities. For the events in Britain which immediately followed the departure of Constantine from the island comes from one source only, and the narrative is anything but clear, anything but easy to patch on to the other recorded events of the time; but there is no reason to doubt the final result, however hard it may be to trace out the exact causes and connexion of events. In the

version of Zôsimos, Gerontius, at the time of his quarrel with Constantine, stirs up the barbarians who were then in Gaul against the master against whom he had revolted. This movement in Gaul seems in his narrative to take the place of the barbarian settlement in Spain. And in a certain sense that settlement might be spoken of as a movement against the power of Constantine. But the narrative of Zôsimos rather suggests a direct attack on Constantine's dominion in Gaul made by the barbarians who were already in that land, and this it is certainly hard to find a place for among the events of the time as more clearly handed down to us elsewhere. That Gerontius was in league with the Vandals, Alans, and Suevians seems certain; that he took with him allies or mercenaries of those nations in his march against Vienne and Arles there is no reason to doubt. But there is no sign of any general movement on the part of the invaders of Gaul against that south-eastern corner which still clave to Rome, even though to Rome represented by Constantine. Still some of their numbers did doubtless march against Constantine, if only under another Roman banner. And, when we are told that, in order to defend himself from barbarian enemies, Constantine sent for other barbarians from beyond the Rhine, we seem clearly to see the host that Edobich brought to the relief of Arles. But it is hard to see how the presence of that host in Provence, or indeed in any part of Gaul, could have caused the inhabitants of Britain to throw off the Roman dominion and to establish themselves as an inde-

pendent people. They took arms, we are told; they freed the cities of Britain from the attacks of the barbarians, and they refused to live any longer according to the laws of Rome*. No account could be more trustworthy on the face of it, if we are to understand the story of a struggle of the inhabitants of Roman Britain, forsaken by their Roman masters and protectors, against the barbarians of their own island. But, unless we are to suppose an unrecorded invasion from the continent beaten back by native British valour, it is hard to see the connexion between the new barbarian movements in Gaul and the assertion of British independence. It will be remembered that there was a difficulty of the same kind when the changes in Britain which led to the whole career of Constantine were connected in a not very intelligible way with the great invasion of Gaul†.

Yet, whatever we may say as to the relations of particular events to one another, the general fact which Zôsimos records is none the less certain, none the less important in the general history of the world. In these few words which he drops as it were by chance he gives us the key to the whole later history of Britain; he tells us in short why we are and

* The story in Zôsimos, vi. 5, must be taken together to see its full difficulty, not to say contradiction; *Γερόντιος . . . ἐπανίστησι Κωνσταντίνῳ τοὺς ἐν* Κελτοῖς *βαρβάρους. Πρὸς οὓς οὐκ ἀντισχὼν ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος ἅτε δὴ τοῦ πλείονος τῆς δυνάμεως μέρους ὄντος ἐν* Ἰβηρίᾳ, *πάντα κατ' ἐξουσίαν ἐπιόντες οἱ ὑπὲρ τὸν* Ῥῆνον *βάρβαροι κατέστησαν εἰς ἀναγκὴν τούς τε τὴν* Βρεττανικὴν *νῆσον οἰκοῦντας καὶ τῶν ἐν* Κελτοῖς *ἐθνῶν ἔνια τῆς* Ῥωμαίων *ἀρχῆς ἀποστῆναι καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν βιοτεύειν, οὐκέτι τοῖς τούτων ὑπακούοντα νόμοις.*

† See above, p. 44.

what we are instead of being like our neighbours in Gaul and Spain. That there is in any part of the world an English folk speaking the English tongue is largely owing to the facts which lurk in the short statement that the Britons took up arms and set free their cities. The existence of a British people in Britain, a British people free, bearing arms and knowing well how to wield them, was an essential condition of the growth of an English people in Britain. When our turn soon came to take our greatest part in the general Wandering, we had another work to do from that which fell to the lot of Goths, Vandals, and Franks. They had hardly more to do than to receive the submission of Romans; the conquest was so easy that they themselves were conquered; in speech, in much besides speech, the Goth and the Frank became Romans. We had not to receive the submission of Romans but to overcome the long and stubborn resistance of independent Britons. The Roman of Gaul made in the end the moral conquest of the Frank, because he never overcame him, never faced him, on the field of battle. The Briton had no chance of making the moral conquest of the Angle or the Saxon, because year after year he withstood him, face to face and hand to hand, in defence of a land which was his own land and not the land of a foreign master. The difference is written on the whole history of the fifth and sixth centuries. The Angle and the Saxon won Britain in fight, in fight, not against Romans, but against Britons. The Teutonic invaders of Britain did not turn their arms against one another till they were

well settled in the land. The Frank won Gaul in fight; but it was almost wholly in fight with fellow Teutons that he won it. Save in the new-born British peninsula, there were no avowed Celtic enemies to fight with; with Romans, that is with Celts who had become Romans, the Frank had to fight only at that one stage when he won the Roman remnant of Syagrius. And there again we are followed by the thought whether, at Constantinople at least, Syagrius was not held for a tyrant and Chlodowig for a loyal officer of Augustus. In truth Gaul is what it now is, Britain is what it now is, because there was no day on Gaulish soil like the day when Saxon Cerdic had to fall back for a moment before the might of British Arthur.

Britain, forsaken by Rome, had fallen away from Rome. Terminus had withdrawn within the lands on his own side of the stream of Ocean. And Rome herself had presently to look the fact in the face; she had to come as near to formally acknowledging the fact as the proud forms of Roman diplomacy would allow. Another passage of Zôsimos, thrust strangely into the narrative of a wholly different series of events, tells us again in a casual way that Honorius sent letters to the cities of Britain bidding them guard themselves* (410). If we can put any

* In Zôsimos, vi. 10, in the midst of the story of Alaric and Attalus, we read suddenly; *Ὀνωρίου δὲ γράμμασι πρὸς τὰς ἐν Βρεττανίᾳ χρησαμένου πόλεις φυλάττεσθαι παραγγέλλουσι, δωρεαῖς τε ἀμειψαμένου τοὺς στρατιώτας ἐκ τῶν παρὰ Ἡρακλειανοῦ πεμφθέντων χρημάτων, ὁ μὲν Ὀνώριος ἦν ἐν ῥαστώνῃ πάσῃ τὴν τῶν ἀπανταχοῦ στρατιωτῶν ἐπισπασάμενος εὔνοιαν.*

trust in the chronology of this most confused narrative, these letters were sent in the year of the fall of Rome, but before its fall, while Constantine was still reigning in Southern Gaul. It is not wonderful then if writers in Britain saw a more direct connexion than there really was between the taking of the Roman city and the end of the Roman power in Britain*. The notice in Zôsimos certainly looks like a formal recognition of the fact that Rome could no longer keep any dominion in Britain, and we cannot help connecting his words with an entry in that one among the continental annalists who seems to have kept the most careful eye on British affairs. He, one of the bearers, by whatever right, of the name of Prosper, speaks, though in vague language, certainly of a decay, perhaps of an utter ending, of the Roman power in Britain, not in the year of the taking of Rome, but in the year just before it† (408). The letters of Honorius would seem to imply a withdrawal of Roman legions from Britain, if only we could conceive any Roman legions remaining there after the crossing of Constantine into Gaul, and still more after the complete separation of Britain from the Roman dominion which Zôsimos himself had recorded a few chapters before. And the letters from Honorius to the Britons would seem to imply some application from the Britons to Honorius, which is again somewhat puzzling, as one would have thought that, in the year 408 or 409, the Roman power would in

* See the extracts in note, p. 11.

† Prosper Tiro, Roncalli, 748 ; "xv. Hon. Hac tempestate præ valetudine [?] Romanorum attenuatæ Britanniæ."

British eyes have been represented by Constantine. Yet it might be that, having seen how little Constantine could help them, the Britons betook themselves to Honorius as their last chance. In any case, whatever may have been the exact details and the exact chronological order, Zôsimos and the annalist cannot fail to refer to the same general course of events, a course of events which carried with it the separation of Britain from the Roman Empire.

It is not easy to reconcile these notices of British affairs in the continental writers with the traditions which lingered in the island itself, and which are handed down to us by later British and still later English writers. Yet the notices in Zôsimos and in the so-called Prosper must refer to the same events as those which, in Gildas and after him in Bæda, take the shape of two embassies from Britain to Rome. Of these the former leads to the sending of a legion, which drives back the enemy and then goes away *. The barbarians then come again; a second embassy leads to the sending of a second legion, which, after more victories, goes away, and the Romans leave the island for ever †. And these

* Gildas, 12; "Mox destinatur legio præteriti mali immemor, sufficienter armis instructa: quæ ratibus trans oceanum in patriam advecta, et cominus cum gravibus hostibus congressa, magnamque ex eis multitudinem sternens, et omnes a finibus depulit, et *subjectos cives* tam atroci dilaceratione et imminenti captivitate liberavit." This is copied by Bæda, i. 12, who gives here "cæteros *sociorum* finibus expulit."

† Gildas, 14; tells this with such a wonderful mass of metaphors

two expeditions are in the mind of Gildas connected with two great works of Roman power in the island. When the first legion withdraws, the Britons are told to build them a wall to keep out the enemy. They throw up a dyke only, which proves of no use. The second legion therefore, before it goes away, builds a stone wall, and further defends the south coast, as being most exposed to the barbarians—that is clearly to the Saxons—with a regular belt of towers, which may suggest the martellos of a much

and other flights of fine writing that the plain English understanding of Bæda failed to grasp his meaning. When Gildas said that the Roman troops "terribiles inimicorum ungues cervicibus infligunt mucronum casibusque foliorum tempore certo assimulandam istam peragunt stragem," Bæda thought it all meant that the legion came in the fall; "Mittitur legio quæ inopinata tempori auctumni adveniens magnas hostium strages dedit." The facts of Gildas, 14, so far as they can be dug out of the rhetoric, seem to stand thus; "Mittuntur ... legati ... impetrantes a Romanis auxilia. ... At illi ... cursus accelerantes ... inimicorum ... peragunt stragem atque ... si qua tamen evadere potuerant, propere trans maria fugaverunt." But what follows, fine writing as it is, is worthy of notice, because it contains the same general idea which we get from Zôsimos, that of armed Britons defending themselves; "Romani patria reversi, denuntiantes nequaquam se tam laboriosis expeditionibus posse frequentius vexari, et, ob imbelles erraticosque latrunculos, Romana stigmata, tantum talemque exercitum, terra ac mari fatigari; sed ut insula potius, consuescendo armis ac viriliter dimicando, terram, substantiolam, conjuges, liberos, et, quod his majus est, libertatem vitamque totis viribus vindicaret, et gentibus nequaquam se fortioribus, nisi segnitia et torpore dissolverentur, ut inermes vinculis vinciendas nullo modo, sed instructas peltis, ensibus, hastis, et ad cædem promptas protenderent manus, suadentes."

Bæda (i. 12) gives a rational abridgement of this tall talk.

later day. Here we plainly have a confused memory of the more northern dyke of Antoninus, and of the more southern wall of Hadrian, Severus, and Theodosius *. We have here got into an atmosphere of legend; yet these two embassies clearly answer to the two notices in Zôsimos, though oddly enough while the Greek writer attributes the driving back of the barbarians to the valour of the independent

* Gildas, 12; after the first legion's coming, adds; "Quos [cives] jussit [seemingly *legio*] inter duo maria constituere trans insulam murum, ut esset arcendis hostibus turba instructus terrori civibusque tutamini: qui vulgo irrationabili absque rectore, factis non tam lapidibus quam cespitibus non profuit." Then, 14; before the departure of the second legion, "Romani . . . murum, non ut alterum sumptu publico privatoque, adjunctis secum miserabilibus indigenis, solito structuræ more, tramite a mari usque ad mare inter urbes, qui ibidem forte ob metum hostium collocatæ fuerant, directo librant; fortia formidoloso populo monita tradunt, exemplaria instituendorum armorum relinquunt. In litore quoque Oceani ad meridianam plagam, qua naves eorum habebantur, quia ut inde barbariæ feræ bestiæ timebantur, turres per intervalla ad prospectum maris collocant, valedicunt tamquam ultra non reversuri." Gildas himself had clearly no notion of either wall belonging to an earlier time. Bæda, on the other hand, had already recorded the building of the wall of Severus (5), and clearly knew both walls. He therefore, in his abridgement of Gildas' rhetoric, puts in the words "ubi et Severus quondam vallum fecerat," and adds some details and measurements. The writer of the analysis of Gildas' chapters does the like. But both these writers seem not to have known that the northern wall was earlier; so Bæda describes it with some minuteness as a work of this time.

Bæda knew his Roman history a great deal better than Gildas. That is to say, at his distance of time, he had really read and thought about it. Gildas, so much nearer to the time, simply sets down the careless traditions of his own day.

islanders, the Briton gives the credit to Roman legions sent over for that purpose. Yet Gildas is perhaps a little disposed to undervalue the merits of his countrymen, and the account in Zôsimos agrees far better with the real state of things on the continent at the time. Even amid the rhetoric of Gildas the Britons are left with arms in their hands, and arms which they knew how to wield. But left they are; the Briton has now to defend himself how he can without Roman help. No dates are given to these events by Gildas or Bæda; but the English Chronicler, who says nothing of the two embassies, records the final departure of the Romans with a distinct date. But we see a strong legendary element in his story also when he tells how that eight or nine years after the taking of Rome and the end, as far as Britain was concerned, of Roman rule, the Romans in Britain gathered together their hoards and hid part in the ground and carried the rest over to Gaul *. The hiding in

* Chron. 418; "Her Romane gesomnodan al þa goldhord þe on Bretene wæron, and sume on eorþan ahyddan, þæt hie nænig mon syþþan findan ne meahte; and sume mid him on Gallia læddon."

It is curious to contrast these accounts put together from various sources with the version of the loss of Britain given by Procopius, Bell. Vand. i. 2. He looks on the separation of Britain from Rome as accomplished by the assumption of the purple by Constantine; of the earlier tyrants he makes no mention. And it is to be noticed that he speaks more respectfully of Constantine than most writers. It is not clear how far he understood the actual state of things in Gaul and Spain. His words are; *Βρεττανία δὲ ἡ νῆσος Ῥωμαίων ἀπέστη, οἵ τε ἐκείνῃ στρατιῶται βασιλέα σφίσι Κωνσταντῖνον εἵλοντο, οὐκ ἀφανῆ ἄνδρα. ὃς δὴ αὐτίκα στόλον τε ἀγείρας νηῶν καὶ στρατιὰν λόγου ἀξίαν ἐς Ἱσπανίαν τε καὶ Γαλλίαν ὡς δουλωσόμενος στρατῷ*

the ground is of course a guess to explain the frequent finding of Roman coins; but one would think that there must be some groundwork in fact for the space of nine years which the story makes between the time when Roman Emperors ceased to rule in Britain and the time when the Romans themselves left Britain. But it is certainly hard to find in the year 418, the year of the twelfth consulship of Honorius and the eighth of the younger Theodosius, anything recorded in which we can recognize the minutely dated fact of our own Chronicler.

But it is of the deepest importance that, throughout this story, not only in the English Chronicler so long after, but in the British Jeremiah of the next century, the Romans in Britain and out of Britain are looked

μεγάλῳ ἐσέβαλλεν. Then we hear of Honorius designing to fly to Africa and generally of his relations to Attalus, down to the death of Alaric. Then we get back to Gaul and Britain. Constantine is, strangely enough, overcome by the West-Goths under Atawulf, a clear confusion between two sets of events. Gaul seems to be thus looked on as recovered to the Empire; but Britain was not won back, and remained under tyrants; *ὁ τῶν Οὐισιγότθων στρατὸς, ἡγουμένου σφίσιν Ἀδαούλφου, ἐπὶ Γαλλίας ἐχώρησαν. καὶ Κωνσταντῖνος μάχῃ ἡσσηθεὶς ξὺν τοῖς παισὶ θνήσκει. Βρεττανίαν μέντοι Ῥωμαῖοι ἀνασώσεσθαι οὐκέτι ἔσχον, ἀλλ' οὖσα ὑπὸ τυράννοις ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔμενε.* It is not clear who these tyrants were, any more than those mentioned by Jerome in the famous passage on the fertility of Britain in the growth of that brood, Epist. xliii. ad Ctes. (see Gibbon, cap. xxxi. note 186). But Procopius seems to look on Britain as ceasing to be Roman on the appearance of a tyrant within it, a view which was certainly not taken by Constantine himself. The notion of the unity of the Empire was doubtless stronger at Constantinople than at Arles, or even at Ravenna.

on as a separate people, wholly apart from the natives of the island. The Britons are not themselves spoken of as Romans. The Romans are another set of men, spoken of as the English might be spoken of now with reference to India. They are a people who are in the land, but who may possibly go away. We shall better take in the full force of this way of speaking, if we fancy the language which Gildas uses applied to Provence or Aquitaine by a contemporary of Gildas, say by Gregory himself. To such an one the notion of Romans as a separate people, distinct from the people of the land, a people who might conceivably pack up their goods and go away, would have been utterly unintelligible. To such an one the Roman name simply took in the whole free population of the land, save any barbarian new-comers of yesterday. Sidonius was a Roman; even Gregory, under Frankish rule, was still a Roman; but Gildas was not. The fact proves volumes as to the utter unlikeness between the story of Britain in these ages and the story of Gaul. No one denies that the political occupation of Roman Britain was as thorough as the occupation of Roman Gaul; the point on which these notices and all our notices and the whole evidence of history and language goes to prove is that the people of Roman Britain, Romans as they doubtless were by the edict of Antoninus, never became Romans in habits, speech, and feeling, like the great mass of the people of Gaul and Spain. The fact that the British tongue is still spoken in Britain is of only less moment than the fact that the English tongue is spoken. It is no small part of the evidence which

shows the utter contrast between the state of the island and the state of the mainland in the days of which we are speaking. Britain was part of the Roman dominion; Gaul had become in the strictest sense Romania. The Romans, as a distinct people, could go away from Britain and leave the land to its own folk. A clearing out of the Romans from Gaul would have meant something very near to a clearing out of the whole population of the land.

Our immediate story, the story of the great barbarian invasion of Gaul and of all that came of it, has brought us so near to the coming of our own folk into our own land that we may go on, if only by way of episode, a little further. The age in which all that we know of Britain, of now independent Britain, comes from incidental and isolated notices has now set in. The next notice of dealings between Rome and Britain in temporal matters comes when the famous groans of the Britons went up to Aetius, thrice consul* (443). But, before we reach that date, we have two notices of the island in continental annalists. One undoubted contemporary speaks of the growth of the Pelagian heresy in Britain, and how Pope Cœlestine sent Saint German of Auxerre, him whose name still

* It is worth contrasting the scholar Bæda with Gildas. With the Briton Aetius is simply "Romanæ potestatis vir." Bæda tells us how "Aetius vir inlustris qui et patricius fuit, tertio cum Symmacho gessit consulatum." Gildas too merely says, as the result of the letter, "nec pro eis quidquam adjutorii habent." Bæda gives a reason, because Aetius "gravissimis eo tempore bellis cum Blædla et Attila regibus Hunnorum erat occupatus." He goes on with a good deal more about Attila. The Winchester and Peterborough Chroniclers abridge Bæda. The others are silent.

lives by the Tamar and by the Ouse, to recover those who had fallen away * (429). In later writers the mission of German, the mission of German and Lupus, the second mission of German and Severus, are connected in a way which we should hardly have looked for with our own settlement in the island. German helps, in his saintly or prophetic character, towards the overthrow of a host, which, clearly before any date that has been given to the coming of Ælle or Hengest, numbered Saxons in its ranks as well as Picts. It is our own Bæda who tells the tale, and who tells it in so strangely casual a way as to make it clear that he is following British records or traditions †. We are tempted to connect these hints with two notices in

* Prosper mentions the Pelagian heresy in the year 413. In 429 he speaks of its progress in Britain, and adds; "Ad actionem Palladii diaconi, papa Cœlestinus Germanum Autissiodorensem episcopum vice sua mittit, et deturbatis hæreticis Britannos ad catholicam fidem dirigit."

† Bæda's account of the two missions begins in i. 17, where it oddly follows the first coming of the English and the exploits of Aurelius Ambrosius. The story goes on through several chapters. In c. 17 the Pelagian heresy is said to have broken out; "paucos sane annos ante eorum [Anglorum] adventum." German, Bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, are sent, not by Pope Celestine, but by a synod of the Bishops of Gaul. In c. 20, "Saxones Pictique" are the enemies whom German helps to overthrow at the Alleluia victory. In c. 21 German goes to Ravenna, "pro pace Armoricanæ gentis supplicaturus"—a saying in itself to be noticed. He is well received by Valentinian and his mother Placidia. All this therefore happened before Placidia's death in 450. The death of German is placed in 448 and his second mission in 447; but the Saxons appear during the first mission, that of 429.

the annalist who cares most for British affairs, one of which has been already referred to. The words in which he seems to record the overthrow of the Roman power in Britain are strangely mixed up with the Vandal, Alan, and Suevian movements in Gaul and Spain, with the usurpation of Constantine, with a Saxon harrying of Gaul which has been already spoken of, and with the taking of Rome itself*. By a little sifting, most of these events fit nearly into their right years, which brings more nearly home to us the possibility that the weakening of the power of Rome in Britain and the Saxon incursion in Gaul which presently follow may have had something to do with one another. His next note of British affairs is far more distinct, far more important. Whatever we think of its date, the meaning of the statement is clear enough. It comes seventeen years after the last entry (425), that is, a good deal sooner than we should have looked for it. Four years before the mission of German, eighteen years before our own Chronicles place the appeal to Aetius, twenty-four years before they place the beginning of Teutonic conquest in Britain, the so-called Prosper tells us that Britain, worn out by endless slaughters and revolutions, was brought under the power of the Saxons†. This is perhaps the last notice from outside either of the island or of those who were settling in it, till the mention

* The entry of Prosper Tiro quoted p. 149 note, is significantly followed by the words quoted above, about "Saxonum incursione devastatam Galliarum partem."

† "Theod. xviii. [425] Britanniæ usque ad hoc tempus variis cladibus eventibusque laceratæ in ditionem Saxonum rediguntur."

of Britain by the great historian of the next age, which shows how utterly the island had passed away from Roman thought, how it had become a land of fable about which any wild story might safely be told. When Belisarius, in exchange for the Gothic offer of Sicily, offered Britain as an ancient land of the Empire, it must have sounded somewhat more strange than if one of the later kings of England had offered Normandy or Aquitaine*. He knew that the island was greater than Sicily; further than that we may judge of his knowledge by that of his historian. There was the isle of Brettania to the west; there was the more wonderful isle of Brittia to the north, the isle of marvels and mysteries, the isle to which the souls of the dead were rowed by night, the isle where the men of old had built a mighty wall from north to south, on the eastern side of which men were still in the world of ordinary life, while to the west of the bulwark are only worms and evil beasts and a deadly air which of itself slays the man who ventures on the enchanted ground. So soon had the greatest work of Roman power in Britain passed away into the realms of fable. It is more pleasant to hear of threefold folk of the land, British, Frisian, and English—the Saxon strangely has no place in the reckoning of Constantinople—of the English, stoutest of all barbarians in the warfare of men who scorned the help of horses, of their valiant lady, forerunner of Æthelburh and Æthelflæd, who

* Proc. Bell. Goth. ii. 6; Ἡμεῖς δὲ Γότθοις Βρεττανίαν ὅλην συγχωροῦμεν ἔχειν, μείζω τὸ παρὰ πολὺ Σικελίας οὖσαν καὶ Ῥωμαίων κατήκοον τὸ ἀνέκαθεν γεγενημένην.

led her host beyond the sea to chastise her faithless lover. To be sure we have to put up with hints that the Frankish kings claimed the overlordship of the island, and how when an English envoy found his way to the court of Justinian, he came in the following of the embassy of a proud Merwing who would have Augustus decree that Britain was his*. Need we

* All these strange details come from the famous twentieth chapter of the fourth book of the Gothic War. I have spoken of some of them in Appendix C. to the first volume of the Norman Conquest. Nothing can be plainer than that here Βριττία and not Βρεττανία is Britain. We cannot be wrong about an island which contains both English and Britons. But in the passage quoted in the last note the Βρεττανία which is offered to the Goths must have been the real island of Britain rather than the imaginary island of Britanny. So in Bell. Vand. i. 2, Βρεττανία ἡ νῆσος which revolts from the Romans and where the soldiers choose Constantine must be Britain and not Britanny. The confusion in short is hopeless; but one may guess that in Procopius' day the peninsula would be fully established by the name of Βρεττανία, and moreover much more would be heard about it than about the island. Still the evident belief in Βρεττανία and Βριττία as two islands and the division of the history of the real island between the two is very perplexing. There is something singular in the omission of the Saxons, who elsewhere are so much more prominent than the Angles. A Frisian element in the settlement is in every way likely; but it is odd that it should altogether displace the Saxons. And there is something strange also in which he speaks of Angles, Frisians, and Britons as if they were all alike natural inhabitants of the island. The oldest picture of the English is pleasing; but our national habit of fighing on foot is exaggerated by Procopius into utter ignorance of the horse. The passage which most concerns our general story is that which describes the nations of the island and their relations to the Franks;

Βριττίαν δὲ τὴν νῆσον ἔθνη τρία πολυανθρωπότατα ἔχουσι, βασιλεύς τε εἷς αὐτῶν ἑκάστῳ ἐφέστηκεν. ὀνόματα δὲ κεῖται τοῖς ἔθνεσι τούτοις

press the argument further? Can any reasonable man believe that the land of which such fables could be told in the ears of Procopius, of Belisarius, and Justinian, was still a land Roman in speech and law like the land over which the Goth, the Burgundian, and the Frank had cast a slight veneer of the speech and law of the German?

We may have some other time for trying more fully to examine and reconcile all these notices; to bring them into strict chronological harmony is hard indeed. Yet nothing is more likely than that some of those unrecorded English settlements in the eastern and northern parts of the land which helped not a little to make England may have come before

Ἀγγίλοί τε καὶ Φρίσσονες καὶ οἱ τῇ νήσῳ ὁμώνυμοι Βρίττωνες. τοσαύτη δὲ ἡ τῶνδε τῶν ἐθνῶν πολυανθρωπία φαίνεται οὖσα ὥστε ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος κατὰ πολλοὺς ἐνθένδε μετανιστάμενοι ξὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ παισὶν ἐς Φράγγους χωροῦσιν. οἱ δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐνοικίζουσιν ἐς γῆς τῆς σφετέρας τὴν ἐρημοτέραν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν νῆσον προσποιεῖσθαί φασιν. ὥστε ἀμέλει οὐ πολλῷ πρότερον ὁ Φράγγων βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ πρεσβείᾳ τῶν οἱ ἐπιτηδείων τινὰς παρὰ βασιλέα Ἰουστινιανὸν ἐς Βυζάντιον στείλας ἄνδρας αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν Ἀγγίλων ξυνέπεμψε, φιλοτιμούμενος ὡς καὶ ἡ νῆσος ἥδε πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρχεται.

There is something very strange in this account of the great numbers of the three nations in Britain and their overflow into Gaul. It must be some confused version of the Armorican migration, to which we are just coming; but, as Procopius tells the tale, the settlers may just as well have been Angles or Frisians as Britons. That two of the three nations were conquerors who drove out the third he gives no hint. It is possible that he may have mixed up the flight of the Britons with crossings of Saxon invaders from one side of the Channel to the other.

The passage about the wall is stranger still. But nothing brings out better the main point, the distinction between the state of Britain and that of Gaul.

the more memorable landings of Hengest, Ælle, and Cerdic. It is possible that Saint German, on his mission to Britain, may have come across warriors from some of those Teutonic colonies of unrecorded date which grew into the later kingdoms of East-Anglia, Deira, Bernicia, and Mercia*. The chief difficulty is that the strong language of the annalist could hardly be used of a time when the lands which were to be Kent, Sussex, and Wessex were still British, lands whose fate would be much more likely to interest a continental writer than the lands further to the North. But these points do not immediately concern us. Our business now is rather to take the Romans out of Britain than to bring the English into it. It is enough for us that, before the end of the reign of Honorius, before the end of the years with which we are specially concerned, the first land that bore the British name had ceased to be one of the lands to which decrees went forth from Cæsar Augustus. The last land of the West to be won, it was the first to fall away. Between the conquest of Britain and its separation another part of the Empire had seen the conquest and the separation of Dacia. But Dacia had not fallen away in the same sense as Britain; it had rather been found wise to give it up to an invading enemy. But now that the insular Britain had set the example, that example was followed by a land which soon came to be reckoned as a second Britain, if indeed it had not begun to put on that character already. At least from this time, most likely even from an earlier time, the

* See Norman Conquest, i. 26.

north-western peninsula of Gaul, balancing in its geographical position the south-western peninsula of Britain, was beginning to take to itself the name and the nature of a British land. We may believe that, even in the most flourishing days of Roman dominion, this corner of Gaul, so well fitted, as the experience of later ages has shown, to be the last abiding-place of an ancient folk and an ancient speech, had kept traces of the tongue and the traditions of ancient days which were little dreamed of in Romanized Lugdunum and Burdigala. Such relics of former times needed only to be strengthened, to be kept up by settlers from other lands where they had never died out, and there might again come into being, in this one corner of the West, a land as purely Celtic as though no part of Gaul beyond the Alps had ever been reckoned as a province of Rome. Such a strengthening was undoubtedly supplied by the immigration of Britons from the insular Britain fleeing before the swords of Teutonic conquerors. Such, to quote no other writer, not to dwell on long-abiding tradition, is the distinct judgement of Einhard, the very clear assertion of a very clear-headed man *. That assertion it would need some strong contemporary evidence to set aside, and no such evidence is forthcoming. Indeed the saying of

* See the distinct statement of Einhard, Ann. 786. Charles the Great "exercitum in Brittanniam cismarinam mittere constituit. Nam cum ab Anglis ac Saxonibus Brittannia insula fuisset invasa, magna pars incolarum ejus traiciens, in ultimis Galliæ finibus Venetorum et Coriosolitarum regiones occupavit. Is populus a regibus Francorum subactus et tributarius factus," &c.

Procopius about the crowds of Britons who yearly took refuge in the dominions of the Franks, is the saying of a writer with nothing like the clearness of Einhard, but much nearer to the time ; and it looks the same way. That there was an Armorican migration, a migration from the greater Britain to the land which became the lesser, there can be no reasonable ground for doubting. The only question is as to its date. And we may be sure that it began early in the days of Teutonic conquest in the insular Britain. For in the sixth century the continental, the lesser Britain is distinctly marked as a land having a settled being of its own, with its own people, its own princes, quite apart from anything in the rest of Gaul. It is plain that, long before the end of the fifth century (468), there was a British people in this part of Gaul, Britons of the Loire, who played a considerable part in Gaulish affairs, who appear as the allies of the Roman and the Frank, as the enemies of the Goth and the Saxon, as spreading themselves inland as far as the land, perhaps as the city, of the Bituriges, and as driven out of that distant possession by the arms of the Gothic Euric. The Britons of Gaul, the Britons of the Loire, had their deeds recorded in annals which formed part of the materials both of the Goth Jordanis and of Gregory of Tours, and there is more than one reference to their presence in the writings of Sidonius of Auvergne *. At this date at least they are

* The first mention of Britanny or Britons in Gregory of Tours is in the passage ii. 18, 19, which seems clearly to be copied from annals. The earliest fact about them is "Brittani de Bituricis

a recognized people, one of the nations of Gaul, with a prince of their own, called of some a king, who

a Gothis expulsi sunt, multis apud *Dolensen vicum* peremptis." This must not be taken for the Breton *quasi*-metropolis of Dol. The place is Déols in Berry. This note comes among a series of entries from which we gather that Romans, Franks, and Bretons—*Wealas* in short and those who were to become *Wealas*—were on one side, while Saxons and Goths are on the other. The date seems to be 468. Later notices in Gregory are common.

The event recorded by Gregory is told at greater length by Jordanis, Getica, 45; "Anthemius imperator Brittonum solatia postulavit, quorum rex Riotimus cum duodecim millibus veniens in Bituricas civitatem Oceano e navibus egressus susceptus est. Ad quod rex Vesegothorum Eurichus innumerum ductans advenit exercitum diuque pugnans Riotimum Brittonum regem, antequam Romani in ejus societatem conjungerentur, effugavit." Riotimus fled to Burgundy.

Sidonius refers to all this in his letter to Vincentius about the affair of the prefect Arvandus (see Gibbon, ch. xxxvi. vol. vi. p. 198, ed. Milner). Arvandus was said to have dictated a treasonable letter to Euric; "Hæc ad regem Gothorum carta videbatur emitti, pacem cum Græco imperatore dissuadens, Britannos super Ligerim sitos impugnari oportere demonstrans, cum Burgundionibus jure gentium Gallias dividi debere." In iii. 9 we have a letter from Sidonius to Riothamus, clearly the same as the Riotimus of Jordanis, in which he speaks of one who "mancipia sua, Britannis clam sollicitantibus, deplorat." This is about 472.

The phrase "Græcus imperator" is odd. It is not a Roman, though it is a Gothic, way of speaking of the Eastern colleague, and it has been thought not to mean Leo, but to be a sneering way of pointing at Anthemius, the Western Emperor sent by Leo. Yet Sidonius could write (Can. xxii. 30) in the Panegyric of this very Anthemius,

> "Salve, sceptorum columen, regina Orientis,
> Orbis Roma tui, rerum mihi principe misso,
> Jam non Eoo solum veneranda Quiriti,
> Imperii sedes, sed plus pretiosa, quod exit
> Imperii genitrix."

played a part in the general politics of the land. This prince, Riotimus by name, appears by that name in the story of Jordanis and he is numbered among the correspondents of the poet-bishop. And this people is found ranged alongside of the same allies and in face of the same enemies against whom we should look to find them ranged. The *Wealas* of either world, *Rum-Welsh, Gal-Welsh, Bret-Welsh*, with their ally the Frank, still the faithful soldier of Rome, against the more-abiding Teutonism of the Goth and the still young barbaric life of the Saxon. The continental Britons could hardly have gained this position, if their first migration had happened after 449. We may rather believe that the migration of those who fled from the Saxon *seax* merely strengthened a British element which had already taken root on Gaulish soil. The beginnings of this earlier British settlement have been with much likelihood attributed to the days of the elder tyrant Maximus *. Their coming however made no immediate change in the provincial nomenclature of the Empire. The only Britain known to the *Notitia Imperii* is still the island; the continental Britain, perhaps already so called in common speech, is not entered among the divisions of Gaul. The Lesser Britain was in no way distinguished from the Greater in either the older or the younger form of the Roman tongue, as in the tongue of the Saxon conqueror it has come to be by a slight difference in the form of the name. But in the great survey of the Empire the Lesser Britain is still hidden under

* See Wietersheim, ii. 71, 166.

the general name of Armorica, a name then of far wider extent, taking in at least so much of Gaul as lay between the Seine and the Loire *. The Armorican name seems afterwards to have shrunk up into a synonym for the Lesser Britain; but we should be led astray if we put so narrow a sense upon the word even in the sixth century. At Constantinople, in the days of the Gothic war, the Armorican name took in those lands between Seine and Loire which became the kernel of *Francia* in the later sense, while the lesser Britain seems to have shared the fate of the greater, to have become the subject of the wildest fables, and to have been looked on, no longer as a peninsula of the mainland, but as another island like the land whose name it had taken †.

* See the "Dux Tractus Armoricani," Notitia Imperii, iii. 106. His jurisdiction takes in Avranches, Coutances, and Rouen, and is further extended over five provinces, Aquitania Prima et Secunda, Senonia, Secunda Lugdunensis et Tertia. He too has "Littus Saxonicum." See Böcking's Dissertation, v. 817 et seqq.

† Whatever we make of Procopius' account of the Ἀρβόρυχοι in Bell. Goth. i. 12, we cannot doubt, First, That the word is the same as *Armorici* or *Aremorici*, and, Secondly, That it is not meant to be confined to the peninsula of Britanny. His story is most likely a confused account of the conquest of the Roman land of Syagrius by Chlodowig. Its inhabitants did become one people with the Franks, which the Bretons have never done.

So when Sidonius in the passage quoted above, p. 39, uses the old formal phrase of "Aremoricus tractus," he certainly does not mean Britanny only; he is perhaps specially thinking of the lands that were to be Normandy and Anjou.

Of the wonderful stories of Procopius I have spoken already. He clearly got his tales about Britain and Britanny from some quite different source from that where he found his notice of the Ἀρβόρυχοι.

At the stage which we have now reached, when the insular Britain had fallen away from the dominion of Rome, the example of the islanders is said to have been followed by a considerable part of the Gaulish mainland. If we can accept the geography of our only informant, the spirit of independence spread far beyond the region which did in the end put on a character apart from the rest of Gaul. It was not merely the new continental Britain, but the whole Armorican land and other provinces besides, which asserted their independence of a power which could no longer defend them against barbarian inroads. They drove out the officers of the Roman government and set up an independent state of their own *. We yearn to know the form of its constitution; but such knowledge is denied us. We may gather from an incidental source that the revolution was not brought about without changes within as well as without, changes, it would seem, social as well as political. But from the same source it would also seem that the independence of Armorica, at least in the wider sense, was not lasting. A few years later (417–420), a poet of Southern Gaul could rejoice that Exuperantius, seemingly Præfect of the Gauls, had brought back peace to the shores of Armorica and had restored the reign of law and freedom. The poet's standard of freedom may have been different from that of a large part of the inhabitants of Armorica. The effect of the

* Zôsimos, vi. 5; *ὁ Ἀρμόριχος ἅπας καὶ ἕτεραι Γαλατῶν ἐπαρχίαι, Βρεττανοὺς μιμησάμενοι, κατὰ τὸν ἴσον σφᾶς ἠλευθέρωσαν τρόπον, ἐκβάλλουσαι μὲν τοὺς Ῥωμαίους ἄρχοντας, οἰκεῖον δὲ κατ' ἐξουσίαν πολίτευμα καθιστᾶσαι.*

renewed rule of order was that men were no longer slaves to their own bondmen *. We need many more details before we can judge of the exact force of these words, whether they need imply such a revolution as had happened of old in the Etruscan Volsinii, when personal slaves actually set themselves in the seats of their masters. It may be only a poet's dark way of describing changes which put power into new hands, perhaps in the districts to which such a picture would apply, into the hands of the old natives of the land strengthened by the new settlers of kindred race. The whole subject is dark, and we can hardly get beyond probable guesses. We hear of further Armorican revolts, and, when the Franks made their way into central Gaul, we find the eastern part of Armorica in the wide sense, to a great extent a Roman land, a land which clings to its Roman standing when Rome herself obeyed a barbarian king. But long before that time, as we have just seen, that part of Armorica which formed the continental Britain was a distinct land, with its own people and princes. The inference seems to be that the restoration of Roman power by Exuperantius was abiding, at

* Rutilius Namatianus (i. 213) speaks of a kinsman of his

"Cujus Aremoricas pater Exsuperantius oras
Nunc postliminium pacis amare docet.
Leges restituit libertatemque reducit,
Et servos famulis non sinit esse suis."

The date (see Tillemont, v. 659) of the poem is shown by an astronomical argument to be either 417 or 420.

In Prosper Tiro (427?) we read, "II [Theodosii] in Galliis Exsuperantius præfectus a militibus interficitur." That may be the date of the undoing of his work.

least for some generations, in Armorica in the wider sense, but that in the peninsula which was becoming British, if the Roman power was ever really again set up, it was cast off again in one of the later revolts.

This restoration of the Roman power in Armorica was, we can hardly doubt, connected with another change in the affairs of Gaul which brought two other Teutonic nations to the front in that land, and led to a lasting settlement of one of them which has affected geography ever since. The Franks, as the ruling, or indeed as a leading, people in Gaul, hardly come within the strict range of our present inquiry; the fascination of our own settlement in the second of our three great homes, a fascination the stronger because of the darkness in which our coming is enwrapped, has carried us on that head somewhat beyond our proper limits. But we have come in due order to the first settlements of the West-Goths and the Burgundians within the lands of the Empire, and to the events in the history of the Empire itself, the rise and fall of more than one tyrant, by which those settlements were accompanied. And before all it will bring before us one of the noblest forms in the whole history of our race, one of the men to whose lot it fell to shape the fates of ages, the kingly form of Atawulf the Goth.

V.

[WEST-GOTHS AND BURGUNDIANS.]

We have to deal now with the settlement on Gaulish ground of the West-Goths and of the Burgundians. The two names call up widely different thoughts. The Goths seem to belong wholly to the past; the nation is gone; the name is gone; it is mere accident through which the people of Atawulf and the people of Gaiseric seem still to give kingly titles to the sovereigns of Northern Europe. But the Burgundian name is so familiar as the name of a land of modern Gaul, its intermediate history calls up associations so utterly alien to our present tale, that it is a little hard to picture to ourselves Burgundians, like Goths or Vandals or Saxons, as playing their part in the Wandering of the Nations. The Burgundian name seems in a manner out of place, almost as the English name does. Yet when we compare the history of the two nations, of the modern-sounding Burgundians and of the Goths who seem to belong to so much more distant an age, we shall find that, if the Goths were less abiding as a name—it may be doubted whether they were less abiding as a nation—they were much longer-lived as a political power. The Burgundians, as a people and kingdom, enjoyed little more than a century of independence, and that independence tempered by

a degree of deference to the Empire unusual among the nations of Gaul. The Gothic dominion, on the other hand, was not swept away, even in Gaul, till the days of Saracen conquest in the West. Yet the name of Gothic has been for some ages swept away from Gaulish soil, while the endless changes in the meaning of the word *Burgundy*, from the time of the first Burgundian settlement down to quite modern days, have been among the standing puzzles of geography. Both these nations now begin to play an important part in Gaulish history.

The Goths show themselves for the first time on Gaulish soil in the year that followed the fall of Constantine (412). Very short had been the time of peace, the time of union under the acknowledged princes of East and West. Perhaps within a twelvemonth of Constantine's overthrow, tyrants again show themselves in Gaul, tyrants who have, as before, to be put down by barbarian help; but who show more distinctly than before how very largely their power rested on barbarian support. In the year that we have just spoken of we read in our annals that the West-Goths under Atawulf entered Gaul and that Jovinus assumed the purple at Mainz, by the help of the Alan Goar and of the Burgundian Gunthachar. And in the following year (413) we read that the Burgundians obtained the part of Gaul next to the Rhine*.

* The entries in Prosper are;

"412. Gothi rege Athaulfo Gallias ingressi.

413. Burgundiones partem Galliæ propinquantem Rheno obtinuerunt.

Jovinus et Sebastianus fratres in Gallia regno arrepto interempti."

It must strike us at once that we have now come to regular political action in a region whose name we have as yet heard only as suffering passing ravage. One cannot doubt that the authority of Constantine had been acknowledged throughout Eastern Gaul. That would be pretty well shown by his being acknowledged at once at Trier and at Arles; but Trier is the only point north of the Rhoneland where we see distinct traces of him. It is very hard to keep ourselves from already speaking of that land as Burgundy, though the events with which we are now concerned are enough to show how much such a name would be before the time. We have come, not to the first of all the Burgundies in the world, but to the first Burgundy within the bounds of Gaul. And that Burgundy finds itself, not on the lower Rhone, but on the middle Rhine. The centre of action is at Mainz, a city of which we heard as grievously suffering in the great invasion of five

This makes rather too short work of two years.

The other Prosper has;

"xviii. [Honorii]. Rursum alia prædatio Galliarum, Gothis qui Alarico duce Romam ceperant, Alpes transgredientibus.

xix. Jovinus tyrannidem post Constantinum invadit."

Idatius (see above, p. 118, note) only mentions the usurpation of Jovinus and Sebastian in 412. He does not mention the Goths till next year at Narbonne.

Orosius in the Catalogue of tyrants (vii. 42) says; "Jovinus postea vir Galliarum nobilissimus in tyrannidem mox ut assurrexit cecidit. Sebastianus frater ejusdem hoc solum ut tyrannus moreretur elegit. Nam continuo ut est creatus occisus est." So Philostorgios, xii. 8; *κατὰ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους Ἰωβιανός τε ἐπανέστη, εἰς φθορὰν ἀπέσβη καὶ Σεβαστιανὸς ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἴσοις ἐποφθαλμήσας, τὴν ἴσην ἔδωκε δίκην.*

years earlier; but which may have risen from its ruins as easily as Trier. Of the actors in the movement, one we have heard of already. He is the Alan King Goar who had been won over to the Roman service, but, like most of his fellows, was not specially scrupulous as to his strict allegiance to any one Roman prince over another*. His partner in setting up the new Augustus was the head of one of the two Teutonic nations who are now winning themselves homes in Gaul, Gunthachar the Burgundian. The name of his people has long been familiar in the history of the Empire, and a generation or more before Gunthachar they had played a great part in some of the wars on the Gaulish frontier. But, as there is no ground for the legend which claimed for them a Roman origin, neither is there any ground for the belief of some scholars that they were, before the times with which we are dealing, already settled on Gaulish soil†. Burgundians also

* The best account of the whole story comes from Olympiodôros (p. 454 et seqq.). The passage which at present concerns us is this; *Ἰοβῖνος ἐν Μουνδιακῷ τῆς ἑτέρας Γερμανίας κατὰ σπουδὴν Γοὰρ τοῦ Ἀλανοῦ καὶ Γουντιαρίου ὃς φύλαρχος ἐχρημάτιζε τῶν Βουργουντιόνων φύλαρχος τύραννος ἀνηγορεύθη.*

Goar is the Alan chief who joined the Romans in 407. He is therefore not marked as *φύλαρχος*, while Gunthachar, head of the Burgundian nation, is. These names in *-char*, as they are now written, are of course the same as our names in *-here.*

There can be no doubt that the *Μουνδιακόν* of Olympiodôros is Moguntiacum, or Mainz. The form may possibly show that the name was already beginning to be shortened. *Mediomatrici* had fully sunk to *Mettis* in the course of the next century.

† These points are discussed at great length by Albert Jahn, *Geschichte der Burgundionen und Burgundiens*, i. 237 et seqq.

find their place in some of the vaguer lists of the nations which took a part in the great movement of the year 406*. But we have no distinct account of their share, if they had any, in the transactions of the last six years. There is nothing to show that they bore any part in the general harrying of Gaul; they clearly had none in the partition of the lands. Whether they took any part in the wars of Constantine and his enemies depends on a single most confused passage*. On the whole we may safely say that, if the Burgundians took any part at all in the great events of those memorable years, it was not as chief actors, but in the way in which, in those days of wandering, stray detachments of almost any nations may get mixed up in the acts of any other. But if the Burgundians stood aloof from these greater movements, they might be thereby the better able to settle quietly, almost without notice, in some convenient region near to their older seats beyond the Rhine. Such a settlement they had clearly made by the year following the elevation of Jovinus (413), the year in which their occupation of part of Gaul

The zeal of this author to refer to every writer from the earliest days to our own day who has said a word upon the subject sometimes makes it hard to dig out his own conclusions. But he seems to show with clearness that there is no reason to suppose any lasting settlement of the Burgundians in Gaul before that with which we are now concerned.

* In the passage from Gregory quoted above, p. 116, Burgundians are mentioned in the army said there to have been led by Jovinus, that is really by Edobich. They may have been there along with the Franks and Alemans, or the mention of them may be owing to the same confusion as the mention of Jovinus.

is recorded. And we cannot help connecting the two events which are brought so close together, the elevation of Jovinus and the Burgundian occupation. We may be sure that the Burgundian help which Jovinus received was paid for by the new Emperor with a formal grant of Gaulish territory to the Burgundian king and people. Jovinus and his power lasted but for a moment; but the settlement of the Burgundians, or at least of their name, was for ever. Setting aside the north-eastern corner of Gaul that was held by the various tribes of Franks, the settlement of Gunthachar was the first Teutonic settlement in Gaul, as distinguished from mere harrying. It was the first establishment of a regular Teutonic kingdom, even if a kingdom dependent on the Empire, as distinguished from these mere plantations of prisoners or mercenaries as immediate subjects of Rome*.

The march of Atawulf into Gaul, the elevation of Jovinus, the establishment of the Burgundians, were all made possible by the withdrawal of Constantius from Gaul after the fall of Constantine, whether he withdrew to rest in Italy or to fight in Spain. A new and in some points dark period now opens, a period in which it is not hard to follow the mere order of events, but in which the connexion of events and the working of causes baffle us at every step. Most hard of all is it to account for the course of Atawulf and his West-Goths. They now left Italy for Gaul. We know the fact; we know the date; at causes and motives we are left to guess. If

* See Wietersheim, i.

Atawulf designed any such territorial settlement in Italy as was before long carried out by his successor Wallia, his design at least remained a design that bore no fruit. But if the difficulties of the story are increased, a special interest is added to it by a certain vein of personal romance. The policy of princes and nations was just now largely influenced by the fact that the foremost men of two nations were rival and honourable suitors for the hand of the same bride. Placidia, the daughter of Theodosius, the sister of Honorius, the captive of Alaric, was sought in marriage alike by the King of the West-Goths and by Constantius, already Count and conqueror and to be Consul and Emperor. It adds to the singularity of the case, while it does honour to every side of the character of the Gothic King, that the prize eagerly striven for by such mighty candidates was actually in the power of one of them. Placidia was still the captive of the Goths, but the King of the Goths was Atawulf. Her master was the man who spoke that memorable speech which traced out, which perhaps did much to rule, the coming history of the world. It was indeed a lucky chance for us which brought Orosius to hear the man of Narbonne, the stout soldier of the wars of Theodosius, tell to Jerome in his cell at Bethlehem the words which he had himself hearkened to in his own city in friendly talk with the Gothic King. That the words are truly the words of Atawulf we cannot doubt; the evidence is as good as evidence can be. The thoughts are far more likely to have sprung up freely in the mind of a Goth who wondered

at the new world around him than to have been devised by either a Roman monk or a Roman senator of that day. We seize then our rare chance of listening to the inmost thoughts of one of the men who have indeed made history. We cannot dwell too often on those words so deep with meaning in which Atawulf declared the great change between his earlier and his later thoughts. He had once dreamed of overthrowing the Roman power, of changing Romania into Gothia and placing Atawulf in the place of Cæsar Augustus. The lesson of his life had taught him better. The rule of Rome was the rule of law; by the law of Rome alone could the world be ruled; he, the Gothic king, would wield the Gothic sword in the cause of Rome; he would keep the nations under the shelter of the Roman peace and the obedience of the Roman law*. The man who could speak words like these is at once stamped as holding his place among the wisest and noblest of the world's heroes and sages. Atawulf, like Polybios, had his lot cast in one of the great turning-points of the world's history, and, like Polybios, he understood the memorable age in which he lived. Not all the lore, not all the experience of the friend of Philopoimên and of Scipio had taught him a clearer insight and a wider view than was revealed to the untutored warrior whom the Goths had heaved on the shield when Alaric was lost to them. For fourteen hundred years men have been consciously, or

* The wonderful passage just at the end of the last book of Orosius' Histories has been quoted over and over again. It cannot be read too often.

unconsciously, carrying out Atawulf's teaching, though not always in the lofty spirit of the man who taught the lesson. If we may take the Goth, the noblest form of the Teutonic family, as the representative of the whole household, we may say that all later history has been the carrying out of a process by which Romania has become Gothia without ceasing to be Romania, and Gothia has become Romania without ceasing to be Gothia. If not Atawulf, yet Charles became Rome's Cæsar and Augustus without ceasing to be the Teutonic king that he was born to be. The Gothic sword wielded on behalf of the laws of Rome has been in truth the symbol of the whole history of the European world since the day when the foresight of Atawulf first made it so.

The Goth then is the champion of Rome; but we must remember that the champion of Rome is not necessarily the champion of Honorius. Atawulf no longer thought of placing himself in the seat of Cæsar Augustus; but he kept to himself the power of choosing between rival Cæsars and Augusti. And he did not this time choose the one whom it would have been most easy for him to use as a puppet for his own purposes. The whole story is dark; we are not told why Atawulf led his army into Gaul; but we know that he carried with him a deposed Emperor and the sister of a reigning Emperor. An honourable lover, he would take Placidia to wife, but he would take her only with her own consent and that of her brother. A wise statesman, he was not insensible to the advantage which he might gain in negotiations with the brother from the fact that he had the sister in his

power. And if he had Placidia in his power, he had Attalus also. The Emperor whom Alaric had set up and put down as was convenient at each particular moment, was still in the Gothic camp, "for the occasional purpose," as it has been inimitably put, "of acting the part of a musician or a monarch *." But Attalus could also play a third part, that of a counsellor to his Gothic patron; only his career in this third character is less intelligible than in either of the other two. It is said to have been by his counsel that Atawulf, champion of Rome, having crossed into Gaul, acknowledged as the representative of Rome the prince who had been just set up by Alan and Burgundian help†. Jovinus was indeed, so far as we can see, the acknowledged Emperor in so much of Gaul as admitted any Emperor at all ‡. All men had submitted to him, save only the præfect Dardanus, a puzzling character, the honoured correspondent of

* Gibbon, ch. xxxi.

† Our fullest narrative here comes from Olympiodôros, pp. 454 et seqq. He now says; *πρὸς ὃν* [Ἰοβῖνον] *παραγενέσθαι Ἄτταλος Ἀδάουλφον παραινεῖ· καὶ παραγένεται ἅμα τοῦ πλήθους.*

‡ The Chronicle known as Prosper Tiro gives a clear summary of events, though more than one year seems to be rolled together;

"Jovinus tyrannidem post Constantinum invadit.

Industria viri strenui qui solus tyranno non cessit, Dardani, Ataulfus, qui post Alaricum Gothis imperitabat, a societate Jovini avertitur.

Salustius quoque et Sebastianus occisi.

Valentia nobilissima Galliarum civitas a Gothis effringitur, ad quam se fugiens Jovinus contulerat."

This division of the two first clauses, given in the note in Roncalli (cf. Jahn, Burgundiens, i. 311), alone makes sense. As commonly stopped it would mean that Dardanus helped Jovinus.

contemporary saints, of Augustine and of Jerome, but whom a later saint, our own Sidonius, describes as uniting the characteristic sins of all the tyrants. The inconstancy of Constantine, the recklessness of Jovinus, the faithlessness of Gerontius, were blameworthy each by itself; in Dardanus all were found together *. Yet the career of Dardanus at this time, if harsh and cruel, specially perhaps to the chosen land of Sidonius, is certainly not marked by recklessness or perfidy. He is at least faithful to his master, and serves him well alike in diplomacy and in warfare. That he should do all in his power to keep Atawulf on the side of Honorius was a matter of course; why Attalus should try to enlist him for Jovinus is less clear at first sight. Yet it may be that he had given up all hope of his own restoration to power, but still, as was likely enough, cherished a spite against Honorius and was inclined to support any enemy of his. And we can perhaps understand that Jovinus might at once be afraid of such an ally as Atawulf and might distrust the counsellor who had advised his march. But when we are told that Jovinus reproached Attalus in riddles, we feel that we have got into the region of riddles ourselves †. Anyhow the advances of Atawulf to Jovinus were not received in a friendly

* Of Dardanus bishop Sidonius (Ep. v. 9) says 'cum in Constantino inconstantiam, in Jovino *facilitatem*, in Gerontio perfidiam, singula in singulis, omnia in Dardano crimina simul exsecrarentur." Augustine, ep. 87, calls him "illustrius mihi in caritate Christi quam in hujus sæculi dignitate," and ends "nec tua indignitas parvuli." This talk is only theological.

† Olymp. ib.; Ἰοβῖνος ἀνιᾶται ἐπὶ τῇ Ἀδαούλφου παρουσίᾳ καὶ μέμφεται δ' αἰνιγμάτων τῷ παραινέσαντι Ἀττάλῳ τὴν ἄφιξιν.

spirit, and two other grounds of offence, one of them intelligible enough, presently arose between them.

We have already heard of the valiant Goth Sarus and his fruitless campaign against Constantine in south-eastern Gaul*. This man, the chief seemingly of a small band or tribe of his nation, renowned even among his valiant people for a heroic daring surpassing that of other men, had been first the follower and then the enemy of Stilicho; he was the special enemy of Alaric, and seemingly of his house†. Atawulf, brother-in-law and successor of Alaric, carried on the deadly feud; and Sarus, enemy of Atawulf, presently became the enemy of Honorius also. Bellerid, a favourite officer of Sarus, had been slain by unrecorded but seemingly Roman hands. Honorius took no heed to the crime and dealt out no punishment to the murderer ‡. Sarus, in his wrath, threw off his alle-

* See above, pp. 64, 65.

† The relations of Sarus to Stilicho appear in Zôsimos, v. 30, 34, where he figures as *καὶ σώματος ῥώμῃ καὶ ἀξιώσει τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχον προέχων*. His enmity to Atawulf comes out at the very end of Zôsimos, vi. 13; *Δυσμενῶς ἔχων πρὸς αὐτὸν* [Σάρυν] *Ἀτάουλφος ἔκ τινος προλαβούσης ἀλλοτριότητος*. So Olympiodôros (p. 449) after recording the captivity of Placidia and the elevation of Attalus (A. D. 410), adds, *καὶ ὅτι Σάρον, καὶ αὐτὸν Γότθον ὄντα, καὶ πλήθους μὲν ὀλίγου ἐπάρχοντα (ἄχρι γὰρ διακοσίων ἢ τριακοσίων ὁ λαὸς ἐξετείνετο) ἄλλως δὲ ἡρωϊκόν τινα καὶ ἐν μάχαις ἀκαταγώνιστον, τοῦτον ὅτι Ῥωμαῖοι ἡταιρίσαντο δ' ἔχθρος Ἀλαρίχῳ ὄντα, ἄσπονδον ἐχθρὸν Ἀλάριχον ἐποιήσαντο*. The enmity is here carried back from Atawulf to Alaric. Jordanis in his Getica makes Sarus a king.

‡ Olymp. p. 455; *Σάρος ἦν ἀποστὰς Ὀνωρίου, ὅτι Βελλέριδον, ὃς ἦν αὐτῷ δομεστικὸς, ἀναιρεθέντος οὐδεὶς λόγος τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς ἀναιρέσεως οὐδὲ τοῦ φόνου γίνεται εἴσπραξις*.

Jordanis (Romana, 321) makes Sarus a "Rex Gothorum." Sôzomen

giance to a prince who did no justice *, and betook himself to the obedience of Jovinus.

It was only with a handful of men, eighteen or twenty in all, that Sarus made his way into Gaul. But his enemy was there with a force greater beyond measure. Atawulf met his enemy at the head of ten thousand Goths, where we are not told, but at some point doubtless between Narbonne and the Alps. Sarus, true to his old character, would neither flee nor surrender. He fought against these overwhelming odds in a way worthy of the renown of his former exploits, till he was taken alive and put to death †. Atawulf was not likely to feel more kindly towards the man to whom Sarus had sought to join himself, nor was Jovinus likely to feel more kindly towards the man who had deprived him of such a helper as Sarus.

(ix. 15, see Dahn, Könige des Germanen, v. 57) has been thought to reckon him among Roman tyrants. His words are, *ἀδοκήτως ἀναιροῦνται Ἰοβιανός τε καὶ Μάξιμος οἱ προειρημένοι τύραννοι, καὶ Σάρος καὶ ἄλλοι πλεῖστοι ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐπιβουλεύσαντες τῇ Ὀνωρίου βασιλείᾳ.* Sarus, by trying to join Jovinus, certainly brought himself under this last head; but he seems to be distinguished from the *τύραννοι*.

Sôzomen in an earlier passage (ix. 9) calls him *Σάρος τις βάρβαρος τὸ γένος, εἰς ἄκρον τὰ πολέμια ἠσκημένος.*

* There is a certain likeness to Honorius in the picture of Stephen in the [Old English] Chronicle; only Stephen could fight like Sarus himself.

† Olymp. 455; *Σάρος ἔμελλε πρὸς Ἰοβῖνον παραγενέσθαι· ἀλλ' Ἀδάουλφος τοῦτο μαθὼν, προϋπαντιάζει χιλιάδας δέκα συνεπαγόμενος στρατιώτην [στρατιωτῶν ?] ἔχοντι ἄνδρας περὶ αὐτὸν Σάρῳ ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἢ καὶ εἴκοσιν. ὃν ἔργα ἡρωϊκὰ καὶ θαυμάσει ἄξια ἐπιδειξάμενον, μόλις σάκκοις ἐζώγρησαν, καὶ ὕστερον ἀναιροῦσι.* I am not concerned in the exact force of *σάκκοις*, nor do I see why Mr. Hodgkin (i. 829) should in his first Edition have inferred that Sarus was tortured.

Dardanus too was now clearly in concert with Atawulf, and the annalist who gives him an honourable name attributes it to him that the Goth turned aside from the course of the tyrant *. In another version a much less intelligible cause is given for the breaking out of open enmity between Atawulf and Jovinus. Jovinus associated his brother Sebastian along with himself in the Imperial dignity which he had assumed. On this Atawulf, highly wrathful, we are not told wherefore, sent an embassy to Honorius, offering peace and friendship, and promising to send the heads of Jovinus and Sebastian as pledges of his loyalty †.

The promise was doubly welcome at a time when the throne of Honorius was beset on both sides. Africa had now its tyrant as well as Gaul (412). The most faithful of the servants of Honorius in an earlier day had now turned against him. Heraclian, who had slain Stilicho with his own hand, when to slay Stilicho was deemed good service, who had so steadily maintained the cause of legitimacy and so valiantly defended his own province when Rome was threatened by Alaric and Honorius by Attalus ‡—this model of a faithful ruler of a Roman land had now taken up arms against his sovereign. His

* See p. 180 note.

† Olymp. 455; *Ἰοβῖνος παρὰ γνώμην Ἀδαούλφου τὸν ἴδιον ἀδελφὸν Σεβαστιανὸν βασιλέα χειροτονήσας εἰς ἔχθραν Ἀδαούλφῳ κατέστη. καὶ πέμπει Ἀδάουλφος πρὸς Ὀνώριον πρέσβεις, ὑποσχόμενος τάς τε τῶν τυράννων κεφαλὰς καὶ εἰρήνην ἔχειν.*

‡ On the former career of Heraclian, see, for his slaughter of Stilicho, Zôsimos, v. 37; for his defence of Africa, Sôzomen, ix. 8; Orosius, vii. 29.

career, like the taking of Rome itself, lies apart from our main subject; we are concerned with Heraclian simply as illustrating the abundance of the crop of tyrants, perhaps as showing the brood on a somewhat loftier scale than Constantine, Maximus, or Jovinus. But we have no need to dwell on his invasion of Italy, his fleet which men likened to that of Xerxes, his battle on Italian soil, of his own defeat, his flight to his own Africa, the slaughter at Carthage of his army; they are needful only to set before us the nature of the time in which Atawulf and Constantius played their part *. These dangerous rivals were now drawing nearer to each other's path. Atawulf may well have dreamed that the heads of Jovinus and Sebastian should be the price of the daughter of Theodosius, as the foreskins of the Philistines had been the price of the daughter of Saul. He may have as yet seen in Constantius at worst a hostile negotiator and not a hostile lover. A treaty was agreed to, oaths were exchanged, and the promise of tyrants' heads was before long fulfilled. The geography of the story is wholly dark; we do not know how far south Jovinus and Sebastian had shown themselves in person. Most likely they were still on their way southwards, with

* His revolt is recorded by Prosper, 413, and referred to by Olympiodôros, 457, where Constantius is said to have got rich out of the goods of Heraclian ὃς τυραννίδα μελετῶν ἀνῄρηται. But the grand flourish comes from Orosius, vii. 42; "Nam habuisse tunc iii. M. naves dicitur, quem numerum nec apud Xerxem quidem præclarum illum Persarum regem nec Alexandrum magnum vel quemdam alium regis fuisse historiæ ferunt."

Arles as their most likely goal, where their empire and their lives were cut short. The head of Sebastian was soon obtained, we are not told where or how, and was duly sent to Honorius *. But before the head of Jovinus could follow it, the Gaulish Valentia, the city which had lately (143) stood a siege on behalf of Constans against the forces of Gerontius, had now to stand another on behalf of the present tyrant against the power of Atawulf and the West-Goths. We have no details of the siege, but our single notice seems to point to a stout resistance followed by a storm. "Valentia, the noble—hardly the noblest—city of the Gauls, where Jovinus had sought for shelter, was broken down by the Goths †." Dardanus, there seems reason to believe, stood with Atawulf before Valentia; but there is no need to suppose that Constantius, whose eyes seem just now to have turned towards African affairs ‡, was at this time in Gaul. The next point of the Gothic march was Narbonne, which city the Gothic army entered in the time of vintage. It may be that the King and his Roman colleague were there before them. Any-

* Olympiodôros, p. 455; *ὧν [πρεσβέων] ὑποστρεψάντων καὶ ὅρκων μεσιτευσάντων, Σεβαστιανοῦ μὲν πέμπεται τῷ βασιλεῖ ἡ κεφαλή.*

† See above, p. 180 [citing from Prosper Tiro].

‡ One or two things might suggest that Constantius was at this time, if not actually in Africa, yet engaged with African affairs. A law of 412 (Cod. Theod. vii. 18. 17), addressed to Constantius as "magister militum," has wholly to do with Africa. Orosius (vii. 42) rejoices how "his diebus, præcipiente Honorio et adjuvante Constantio, pax et unitas per universam Africam ecclesiæ catholicæ reddita est." Lastly, it appears from Olympiodôros, p. 457, that Constantius received the confiscated property of Heraclian.

how it seems to have been to Narbonne that Jovinus was brought as a captive. The old colony of Narbo, the colony of Mars, the city which gave its name to the whole Mediterranean land of Gaul, now becomes for a while the chief centre of our story. The first town of Gaul, it would seem, to be held by a Gothic king and a Gothic army, it remained the abiding seat of Gothic dominion north of the Pyrenees long after the Gothic name had passed away from the Loire and even from Garonne. A special creation of Rome, the first established seat of the Gaulish dominion of Rome, the commercial rival which went far for a while to supplant the ancient wealth and greatness of Messalia, Narbo Martius was still in the days of our kings and tyrants one of the foremost of Gaulish cities, but it does not now supply us with the same opportunities for tracing the memory of those times in still abiding monuments which we have so freely enjoyed at Arelate and Vienna. The balance between it and Messalia has been restored by physical changes. The haven of Messalia has been for ages growing greater and greater; the haven of Narbo has passed away far more utterly than that of Arelate. The great mart of Roman trade in Gaul has now become wholly an inland town; the stronghold of the Roman, the Goth, and the Saracen, has become an unwalled town; no works of Imperial days either crown its slight hill or watch over its narrow river; memorials of those days are not lacking, but they are wholly of the kind which are treasured in museums, not of the kind which stand forth first of objects to catch the

beholder's eye at Arelate and at Nemausus. The Narbo of the days of Atawulf and Placidia gathers round it so many interests that there is no city of which we should be better pleased to call up a living picture as it stood when the Gothic host entered its gates. But this is denied us. We cannot see the scene of the doom of Jovinus as we can see the scene of the doom of Constantine. For the captive of Valentia became the victim of Narbo; Jovinus was slain by the hand of Dardanus. His head and the head of Sebastian went in due form to Ravenna, perhaps to Carthage *. It might be well that Africa,

* The words of Olympiodôros are; Ἰοβῖνος δὲ ὑπὸ Ἀδαούλφου πολιορκούμενος, ἑαυτὸν ἐκδίδωσι, καὶ πέμπεται ἐκεῖνος τῷ βασιλεῖ, ὃν αὐθεντήσας Δάρδανος ὁ ἔπαρχος ἀναιρεῖ.

This account needs to be explained and filled up from the other authorities. Thus it is from Prosper Tiro that we learn where it was that Jovinus was besieged; "Valentia nobilissima Galliarum civitas a Gothis effringitur, ad quam se fugiens Jovinus contulerat." Then again the words that follow might make one think that Jovinus was sent alive to Ravenna, and that Dardanus killed him there. But Dardanus, the one loyal man in Gaul, was the ἔπαρχος of Honorius there and not at Ravenna. We may perhaps infer from the word πέμπεται that Atawulf designed to send Jovinus alive to Honorius, but that the act of Dardanus hindered him. We thus get the meaning of the entry of Idatius, 'Jovinus et Sebastianus oppressi ab Honorii ducibus Narbona interfecti sunt," followed by "Gothi Narbonam ingressi vindemiæ tempore." Whatever we say of Sebastian, Jovinus is not "oppressus" at Narbonne, but both are put to death at Narbonne. Nor is it needful to bring Constantius to Narbonne for that purpose; Dardanus is at any rate one "dux Honorii," and Atawulf might be called another. They may have been at Narbonne, though the whole Gothic army did not get there till a little later.

About the sending of heads to Carthage see above, p. 127, n.

restored to the allegiance of its lawful prince, should know that the arm of the lawful prince could strike in other provinces also. A third brother, Sallustius, shared the fate of Jovinus and Sebastian *. And we hear that the re-establishment of the authority of Honorius was accompanied by harsh doings in Auvergne, a land which, we may therefore infer, had been zealous for Jovinus. Many men of rank were put to death, among them Decimius Rusticus, præfect of the Gauls under Constantine and again præfect under Jovinus †. He had, it may be remembered, supplanted Apollinaris, the grandfather of the saint and poet, who may therefore be conceived to have had no special love for him. Yet he was a chief man of Auvergne, he died among others of the chief men of Auvergne, by the act of the generals of Honorius, that is, we can hardly doubt, by the act of Dardanus. The man who slew Jovinus with his own hand was surely the man by whose bidding, perhaps also by whose hand, Decimius, Agrætius, and the other Arvernian nobles met their end. In this slaughter wrought in his adopted country we at once see the ground for the excessive bitterness which Sidonius displays towards Dardanus.

* Prosper Tiro (just before the entry of the fall of Valence) writes [as cited above], "Salustius quoque et Sebastianus occisi." Jahn, i. 313.

† Gregory of Tours (ii. 9) quotes Renatus Profuturus Frigiredus as saying "Hisdem diebus præfectus tyrannorum Decimius Rusticus, Agrætius ex primicerio notariorum Jovini, multique nobiles apud Arvernos capti a ducibus Honorianis crudeliter interempti sunt."

The authority of Honorius was thus yet again acknowledged throughout the whole extent of Roman Gaul. And this time its acknowledgement was enforced by the help of the Gothic sword. But the extent of Roman Gaul was lessened by the same process. The settlement of the Burgundians west of the Rhine was a fact which had to be dealt with. They had not as yet reached any of the lands to which they were to give their name in times to come. Dijon, Geneva, Vienne, Arles, were not as yet seats of Burgundian power. The first Burgundian land in Gaul was, as the chronicler says, in the regions near to the Rhine. It lay among those lands on the Gaulish side of the river which still specially kept the name of Germany. It was at Mainz that the Burgundian king set up his Emperor; Worms was the traditional home of Burgundian kingship. It was then the land of Mainz, Worms, Speyer, stretching southwards along the river into the land of Elsass, perhaps as far as Strassburg, perhaps not, which Jovinus had given over to his allies as the price of his diadem *. How was the land thus occupied affected by the overthrow of the power of Jovinus? It is plain that the Burgundians did not withdraw to their own homes. Gunthachar and his people appear again among the nations of Gaul twenty years later †. And though they then appear as enemies

* Jahn (Geschichte der Burgundionen und Burgundiens, i. 324) traces out the geography very clearly; but I do not see why they may not (p. 329) have reached as far as Strassburg.

† See the entries in Prosper and elsewhere under the year 435. They are fully discussed by Jahn, i. 341 et seqq.

of Rome, yet on the whole the Burgundians are found more closely connected with the Empire than any other of the Teutonic powers. A hundred years and more after this time, when Emperors no longer reigned at Rome or Ravenna, the Burgundian kings still acknowledged the supremacy of their successors at Constantinople, and ruled over their Roman subjects under titles held by the grant of the Roman Augustus *. Our authorities are utterly silent as to the whole matter, except as to the bare fact of the Burgundian settlement. But it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the counsellors of Honorius —was it the act of Atawulf or of Constantius?— acknowledged a fact which it would be hard to undo, and that Gunthachar was commissioned as a lieutenant of the Empire in the lands which had been granted to him by Jovinus †. His position would thus be that which was the formal position of so many barbarian kings, the position of Atawulf and of Wallia, the position of Odowakar and the great Theodoric, perhaps of Chlodowig himself. Gunthachar was Burgundian king to his own Burgundians; he was the partrician or proconsul of the Empire to the Romans of the ceded land. We have no picture of the Bur-

* See above all things the letters from Sigismund to Anastasius, "Sigismundus rex domno imperatori," among the epistles of Alcimus Avitus, 83, 84. One MS. adds emphatically; "ab Avito episcopo dictata est sub nomine domni Sigismundi regis ad imperatorem." But the king must have known what he was sending, and the letters are the letters of a vassel to his lord. Theodoric appears as "rector Italiæ."

† See Jahn, i. 315.

gundians from the hand of Salvianus; but it is quite in conformity with this position of their kings that their rule in Gaul seems to have been acknowledged as that which dealt out the least measure of hardship to the Roman inhabitants. The Burgundians dealt with the older people of the land, not as subjects, but as friends and brothers. There was not, at least not in the beginning, the unhappy difference of religion to sharpen the difference of nationality. The Burgundians were converted to Christianity, if not before their settlement in Gaul, at any rate while their settlement was still fresh. And they were converted to it in its Catholic form *. The Arianism of some of the later Burgundian kings is undoubted, and the belief of the kings was doubtless followed by at least part of the nation. Later in the century the strife between Arian and Catholic in the Burgundian kingdom becomes an important element in the politics of Gaul †. But Burgundian Arianism seems in no sort to have been, with Goths and Vandals, a national

* The good character and catholic belief of the Burgundians comes from a passage in Orosius (vii. 32) earlier than his description of the events with which we have been mainly concerned, a passage in which he mentions this mythical Roman origin, and also the odd derivation of their name from *burgus*. He adds, "Galliæ hodieque testes sunt in quibus præsumpta possessione consistunt, quamvis providentia Dei omnes Christiani modo facti Catholica fide, nostrisque clericis quibus obedirent receptis blande mansuete innocenterque vivant, non quasi cum subjectis Gallis sed vere cum fratibus Christianis."

† This comes out largely in the writings both of Avitus and of Gregory of Tours. See above all the "Collatio Episcoporum" in Peiper's edition of Avitus, p. 161.

faith adopted in the first moment of conversion, but a rare case of the falling away of Catholics to the heretical teaching. At any rate heresy never was universal; the kingly house itself was never without Catholic members *. And, somewhat later than our present time, we hear of Burgundians beyond the Rhine still abiding in heathendom till, at the moment of a Hunnish inroad, they too entered the Catholic fold †. At that date Gunthachar was still reigning over the colony of his people in Gaul. The mention of Huns reminds us that he is one of the chosen heroes of Burgundian story, and that his name, like those of so many of the princes of these ages, found its way into the great Teutonic epic of the Nibelungs ‡.

* On the religion of the Burgundians see Jahn, i. 122, 385. Chrotechildis, whom the French have made into Clotilde, is of course the great case of later Burgundian orthodoxy.

† This comes from the passage of Sôkratês, vii. 30, discussed by Jahn, i. 337. The Burgundians come in; *ἔθνος ἐστὶ βάρβαρον, πέραν τοῦ Ῥήνου ἔχων τὴν οἴκησιν· Βουργουζίωνες καλοῦνται.* It has been questioned whether this really belongs to Burgundians east of the Rhine so late as 430, and whether it is not a confusion with the earlier conversion of the Burgundians in Gaul. In strict geography the words *πέραν τοῦ Ῥήνου* written at Constantinople ought to mean the left bank. But this would imply more accurate study of the map than Sôkratês had a chance of. His knowledge would come from Western informants, who by "trans Rhenum" would mean the right bank. The Burgundians are converted *κατὰ νοῦν λαμβάνοντες ὅτι Ῥωμαίων ὁ Θεὸς ἰσχυρῶς τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτὸν βοηθεῖ.* Here we seem to have almost got back to the Hebrew notion of a national God; but one of the greatest facts in the history of the world lurks beneath the phrase.

‡ See Jahn, i. 341 et al.

Jovinus had been raised to his short day of Empire by the joint help of Burgundians and Alans, of that branch of the Alans who, under Goar, had entered the Roman service when the mass of the nation went on to their harrying in Gaul and their settlement in Spain. But while we can in some sort trace the history of Guntachar and his Burgundians from this time onwards, we seem to lose sight of Goar and his Alans. We get a singular glimpse somewhat later of an Alan king and an Alan army in an alliance with the Goths of which they are weary* (415). We have to guess at the time and circumstances under which this union was formed; but it would be nothing wonderful if, after Jovinus had yielded to Atawulf, the Alans were either constrained or found it prudent to join the side of the conquerors. There seems to be no later mention of Goar or his people; they must have been merged among some of the other settlers in Gaul, or else have joined their brethren in Spain, who were before long to be merged among the Suevians. No lasting settlement of mere Asiatic barbarians was to be made in the Cisleithan lands of Europe.

But other Teutonic people besides the Burgundians were stirring at this time on the eastern frontiers. If the Burgundians had shown themselves at Mainz and Worms, the Franks were at work somewhat further to the north. By that name we must just now understand, not the Franks within the Rhine who were Roman allies and had so lately done their duty in that character. The Franks, of whom we now get

* This comes from the Eucharisticon of Paulinus of Pella, of whom more anon.

a glimpse are the still untamed Franks who lived beyond the boundary stream and who had not yet obtained any settlement within the Empire. The head of Gaul, Augusta of the Treveri, which could hardly have recovered from its sack by Vandals, Alans, or Suevians, was now again taken, sacked, and burned by the Franks *. We have no distinct record of the several takings of Trier, four of which, it must be remembered, came within the memory of Salvianus. It may indeed have been after this sack [and not the earlier one] that the people of Trier drew on themselves the stern preacher's indignant rebuke for thinking, as soon as the enemy was gone, of the games of the circus before all things †. But the language of Salvian himself shows that even this last blow did not separate the capital of Valentinian and Maximus from the Empire. Whatever Trier suffered now, the damage must have been so far repaired that it lived on as a city and as a Roman city.

But the Franks, whether defending the Empire or

* This again comes from Gregory's quotations of Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus. After the passage already quoted in note, p. 104, comes "Treverorum civitas a Francis direpta incensaque est secunda irruptione."

† Salvian, vi. 13, says "expugnata est quater urbs Gallorum opulentissima." But the most striking passage comes at vi. 15, and refers to the third taking of Trier; "ter continuatis eversionibus summa urbe Gallorum, cum omnis civitas combusta esset, malis et post excidia crescentibus." Then "pro summo deletæ urbis remedio circenses ab imperatoribus postulabant." It is possible that Frigeridus and Salvian may reckon the sieges differently and that they may refer to the same taking. If so, the Emperors must be Honorius and, for form's sake, Theodosius.

sacking its cities, do not as yet form the great centre of Gaulish history. At this time a higher interest gathers round the Burgundian, and a higher still round the Goth. At this moment, if Gunthachar was in form a Roman officer, Atawulf was so yet more distinctly. He was so all the more because he was not, like Gunthachar, the ruler of any acknowledged territorial possessions. But his friendship with his formal overlord was not unbroken. The restoration of Placidia was wished for, most likely by her brother, certainly by her Illyrian lover; while his Gothic rival had assuredly no mind to give her up. He was the less likely to do so as long as her detention could be diplomatically justified, as long as the plighted price of her release, corn for the feeding of the landless Goths, and that in a year of hunger, still remained unpaid*. In the very year of the fall of Jovinus (413), Goths and Romans are again in arms against one another.

It can hardly be doubted that Atawulf now aimed at a great Gothic settlement in Southern Gaul, much like that which was afterwards carried out by his successor Wallia. We find him attacking several of the great cities of that region, and as entering into possession of some of them. We know not in what

* The policy of Atawulf and Constantius is well marked out by Olympiodôros. We read now (p. 456), *Ἀδάουλφος Πλακιδίαν ἀπῃτεῖτο κατὰ σπουδὴν μάλιστα Κωνσταντίου, ὃς ὕστερον αὐτῇ καὶ εἰς γάμους ἔζευξεν. ἀλλὰ τῶν πρὸς Ἀδάουλφον ὑποσχέσεων μὴ περαινομένων, καὶ μάλιστα τῆς σιτοπομπίας, οὔτε ταύτην ἀπεδίδου, καὶ εἰς μάχην ἐμελέτα τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διαλύεσθαι.* So in a fragment of Philostorgius, xii. 4, it can only be Constantius who appears as *ἐλπίδας τρέφων, ὡς αὐτὸς καταπολεμήσας Ἀδάουλφον τὴν Πλακιδίαν νυμφεύσαιτο.*

character he waged this warfare, of which we hear only in a most casual way. It would be hardly according to his principles to show himself as the open enemy of the Empire, and we may be tempted to suspect that now, as somewhat later, he followed the policy of setting up a puppet Emperor. It falls in with this view that we incidentally learn that the Goths were admitted into Bourdeaux in perfect peace; Toulouse, future home of Gothic kings, may have been taken in arms; it is certain that Atawulf did occupy both those cities, and this seems the most likely point in the story for either a warlike or a peaceful entry into them *. Of Narbonne we have already seen him in possession, and there his possession could hardly have been disturbed, as we shall see him there again on a memorable day. But when he pressed beyond the Rhone, and planned a surprise of Marseilles, his conquests came to an end. From the Phokaian city he was beaten back with danger to his life. The blow was dealt by the valour, and seemingly by the very hand, of that renowned Count Boniface, the friend of saints and once well nigh a saint him-

* The peaceful occupation of Bourdeaux comes from a single line of the Eucharisticon of Paulinus, when describing events a little later;

"Nostra ex urbe Gothi fuerant qui in pace recepti."

The occupation of Toulouse comes from Rutilius Nematianus, i. 495, where he says of his friend Victorinus,

"Errantem Tuscis considere compulit agris
Et colore externos capta Tolosa lares."

At least Dahn (K. d. G. v. 59) refers the lines to an occupation at this time.

self, but who afterwards fell and rose through the successive stages of sinner, traitor, and penitent *. The negotiations however go on. Constantius is ever demanding Placidia; Atawulf is ever raising fresh pleas to justify his refusal to restore her †. The next year (414) Constantius, clothed in the glories of the consulship and enabled by the confiscated hoards of Heraclian to make his consulship a splendid one ‡, might seem to be a more dangerous enemy than ever. Yet it is now that, through the influence of Candidianus, seemingly the same who figures later in ecclesiastical story §, the formal consent was won without which Atawulf, in the loftiness of his Gothic honour, would take no advantage of the presence of his beloved in his own camp. It hardly takes away from the merit of Atawulf, and it is not likely to have been taken into account in these endless negotiations, that the Gothic king had already a barbarian wife or mistress, of Sarmatian race, by whom he was the father of several

* Olympiodôros, ib.; *Ἀδάουλφος ἀπαιτούμενος Πλακιδίαν, ἀνταπῄτει τὸν ὁρισθέντα σῖτον. ἀπόρων δ' ὄντων τῶν ὑποσχομένων εἰς τὸ δοῦναι, οὐδὲν δὲ ἧττον ὁμολογούντων, εἰ λάβοιεν Πλακιδίαν παρασχεῖν, καὶ ὁ βάρβαρος τὰ ὅμοια ὑποκρίνετο.* Then follows how the barbarian *πρὸς Μασσαλίαν, πόλιν οὕτω καλουμένην, παραγενόμενος, δόλῳ ταύτην λαβεῖν ἤλπιζεν. ἔνθα πληγεὶς, Βονηφατίου τοῦ γενναιοτάτου βαλόντος, μόλις τὸν θανατὸν διαφυγὼν, εἰς τὰς οἰκείας ὑπεχώρησε σκηνὰς, τὴν πόλιν ἐν εὐθυμίᾳ λιπὼν καὶ δι' ἐπαίνων καὶ εὐφημίας ποιουμένην Βονηφάτιον.*

† Ib. p. 457; *Ἀδάουλφος τὸν γάμον μελετῶν Πλακιδίας, Κωνσταντίου ταύτην ἀπαιτοῦντος, βαρυτέρας προῦτεινεν αἰτήσεις, ἵνα διὰ τὴν ἀποτυχίαν εὔλογον δόξῃ τὴν κατάσχεσιν αὐτῆς πεποιηκέναι.*

‡ It is when recording the consulship of Constantius that Olympiodôros (p. 457) mentions the grant of Heraclian's property to him (see p. 185) and gives the personal description of him (see p. 112).

§ See Dict. of Christ. Biog. s. n., and Hodgkin, i. 831, n.

children *. She had to depart to make room for the august bride, and that was all. For now, at the beginning of the year (414), came that famous bride-ale of Narbonne, which it was fondly hoped would be far other than bale to many men, Gothic and Roman †. At the wedding of Atawulf the Gothic king took his place alongside of the daughter and sister of Emperors, while a deposed Emperor led the choir in the wedding-song. The tale has been often told, and in modern Narbonne we shall seek in vain for any sign of the spot, for any trace of the house of Ingenuus which beheld the celebration of the marriage rites. Those rites were gone through in due order according to Roman usage; the bridegroom conformed to the national uses of the bride; the stranger conformed to the national uses of the land in which he was sojourning ‡. Goth and Roman rejoiced with equal

* The *παιδία, ἃ ἐκ τῆς προτέρας γαναικὸς ἐτύγχανεν* Ἀδαούλφῳ *γεγεννημένα* appears in Olympiod. p. 459. Their mother seems to be noticed in a strange fragment of Philostorgius (xii. 4) which shows that an Arian ecclesiastical historian could talk quite as mystically as any Catholic; *βαρβαρικοῦ γὰρ γένους τοῦ Σαυρομάτων χρηματίζειν αὐτὴν καὶ συναφθῆναι τότε τῷ ὀστρακίνῳ γένει τὸν ἐκ σιδήρου τὴν γένεσιν ἕλκοντα· οὐ τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡνίκα πάλιν* Ἀδάουλφος *γαμικεῖς ὁμιλίαις τῇ* Πλακιδίᾳ *συνείπετο, τὴν γὰρ ὀστρακίνην φύσιν . . .*

† See the song of the bride-ale of Norwich, if it was Norwich, in the Chronicles, 1075.

‡ Olympiodôros (457) and after him Mr. Hodgkin (i. 832) describe the wedding with much lively detail. I am most concerned with the first words, Ἀδαούλφῳ *σπουδῇ καὶ ὑποθήκῃ* Κανδιδιανοῦ *ὁ πρὸς* Πλακιδίαν *συντελεῖται γάμος.* The epithalamium is sung Ἀττάλου *πρῶτον εἰπόντος*, and we read, *συντελεῖται ὁ γάμος, παιζόντων καὶ χαιρόντων ὁμοῦ τῶν τε βαρβάρων καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς* Ῥωμαίων. All the ceremonies were Roman, and Atawulf wore a Roman dress. Idatius

joy at the wedding which was in truth the symbolic wedding of Gothia and Romania, the setting forth in a visible shape of the lofty schemes which were working in the mind of Atawulf. The Gothic King, soldier and champion of Rome, was now the brother-in-law of Rome's elder Emperor. But in those days the soldier of Rome, without forsaking the service of Rome, might shift his obedience almost at pleasure from one Roman prince to another. The prince who at the bride-ale had his turn as musician had again before the year was out his turn as monarch. So soon were the Imperial and royal allies, the Roman and Gothic brothers-in-law, again at variance. Constantius had won back his influence with Honorius, and he was likely to be more wroth than ever with the rival who was in actual possession of the prize that had been so long sought for by both. So, wherever the power of the Goth reached, the Rome from whose cause he never fell away was to be repre-

sees in the marriage the fulfilment of the prophecy of Daniel, "qui ait filiam regis Austri sociandam regi Aquilonis." Jordanis (Getica, 31) gives quite an unexpected place to the marriage, which he strangely fits in before the Gothic march into Gaul. In fact his story is utterly confused; but he, or Cassiodorus before him, quite understood the significance of the event. "Cujus [Honorii] germanam Placidiam Theodosii imperatoris ex altera uxore filiam ab urbe captivam abduxit [Ataulfus], quam tamen ob generis nobilitatem formæque pulcritudinem et integritatem castitatis attendens, in Foro Juli Æmiliæ civitate suo matrimonio legitime copulavit, ut gentes hac societate comperta quasi adunatam Gothis rem publicam efficacius terrerentur, Honorioque Augusto quamvis opibus exhausto tamen jam quasi cognatum grato animo derelinquens, Gallias tendit."

sented by another chief. Attalus Augustus appears once more in Gaul under the patronage of Atawulf, as he had appeared for one moment in Italy under the patronage of Alaric*. Wherever the brother-in-law of Honorius had practical dominion in Gaul, there not Honorius but Attalus was Emperor. Of his acts in that character we know at least one. He bestowed a great office on a man who was not eager for it, a Roman of high position and descent, whose singular autobiography throws a good deal of light on these times and reveals to us some particular events of which we might otherwise never have heard.

This is Paulinus, distinguished from many other bearers of his name with some of whom he has sometimes been confounded, as Paulinus of Pella. He notes with some pride that he was a native of the same city as Alexander, though in his day it had become needful to point out the royal seat of the Macedonian kings as being near their own creation of Thessalonica†. But he was not a man of Macedon, but of Gaul. His family was of Bourdeaux or perhaps of Bazas, and he was the grandson of Decimus Magnus Ausonius, poet and consul, some have thought through his son Hesperius, others through his daughter married to Thalassius‡. His

* We here lose Olympiodôros for a season, but the new elevation of Attalus is recorded by Prosper, 414; "Attalus Gothorum consilio et præsidio tyrannidem resumit in Galliis."

† Paulinus, 24;

> "Editus ut Pellius, inter cunabula quondam
> Regis Alexandri prope mœnia Thessalonices."

‡ The point is fully argued in the Preface to the new edition of

birth east of Hadria was owing to the official employments of his father, who at the time of his birth, in the year in which the Goths crossed the Danube (376), held the vice-præfectship of Macedonia*. An appointment to the African proconsulship carried father and son to Carthage; thence the child came by way of Rome to the city of his forefathers, to see his grandfather in the glories of a consulship enjoyed wholly on the banks of the Garonne† (379). The record of his life, his studies, his pleasures, his affairs, the youthful errors which he confesses‡, throws light, like every such record, on the life of the age in which he lived. The piece of detail most worthy of notice is that where, in his somewhat lumbering Latin hexameters, he tells us that he preferred the Greek authors to the Latin, seemingly—was it the result

Symmachus, as before by Leipziger in his Dissertation (Breslau, 1858), p. 3.

* Paulinus, 26;

"Patre gerente vices illustris præfecturæ."

† Ib. 43–49;

"Majorum in patriam tectisque advectus avitis,
Burdigalam veni . . . .
Tunc et avus primum illic fit mihi cognitus, anni
Ejusdem consul, nostra trieteride prima."

As the consulship of Ausonius was in 376, this fixes the dates for the whole life of Paulinus; for he is very careful in always mentioning his own age, though less so in giving the names of other people.

‡ Paulinus, 156 et seqq. The distinction which he draws on this head, and the pointed contrast he makes between "culpa" and "crimen," are worth noting. He was (166)

"Contentus domus illecebris famulantibus uti."

of mere birth in Macedonian air ?—that in his youth the Greek tongue came more familiar to him than the Latin, though in his later days he came to set more store by the tongue which was more native to a man of Bourdeaux, even if casually born at Pella *. From his thirty-first year (407), the year when enemies poured into the bowels of the Roman realm †, his tale of his own life becomes for a while an important contemporary authority for the history of the time. It is from him that we learn the relations between the Goths and the Alans and the Gothic occupation

* Paulinus, 72 ;

"... Exacto primo post tempore lustri
Dogmata Socratis et bellica plasmata Homeri,
Erroresque legens cognoscere cogor Ulixis.
Protinus ad libros etiam transire Maronis,
Vix bene comperto jubeor sermone Latino,
Colloquio Graiorum adsuefactis famulorum,
Quos mihi jam longos ludorum vinxerat usus ;
Unde labor puero, fateor, fuit hic mihi major,
Eloquium librorum *ignotæ apprehendere linguæ*."

This is as curious as Orderic's seeming ignorance of French when he was taken from Shrewsbury to Saint Evroul. The child, born at Pella, is taken before he is three years old to Carthage, Rome, Bourdeaux ; yet Latin is "ignota lingua."

† Ib. 232. The date of the great invasion of Gaul is accurately marked ;

"Sed transacta ævi post trina decennia nostri,
Successit duplicis non felix cura laboris ;
Publica quippe simul clade in commune dolenda,
Hostibus infusis Romani in viscera regni."

His father dies, and he has a dispute with his brother about his mother's dowry.

of Bourdeaux *. Of that city Atawulf was still in possession when he again gave the diadem to Attalus. Paulinus was one of its chief citizens; he won the favour of the Gothic king, and we shall presently see that he was on intimate terms with an Alan king, doubtless Goar. He obtained the special favour of having no Gothic guest quartered on his house †. But the presence of the strangers who had entered the city in peace was no great burthen; the Goth knew the duties of a ruler, and the peace of King Atawulf may well have been better kept than the peace of Honorius Augustus. The virtual ruler now proclaimed the empire of the prince under whom, while Alaric lived, he had once held a high military command, and under whose renewed sovereignty he doubtless rose higher still ‡. Our poet carefully points out that Attalus had in truth no power, no revenue, no soldiers of his own; he was a Roman prince wholly by the grace of the Goth. Not out of love for the helpless tyrant, but out of mixed fear and regard for his Gothic master, Paulinus acknowledged the empire of Attalus, and

* See above, p. 197.

† Paulinus, 282;

> "Otia nota domus specialia commoda plura,
> Omnibus heu nimium blandis magnisque referta
> Delitiis, cunctisque bonis in tempore duro,
> Hospite tunc et quæ Gothico jam sola careret."

‡ When Alaric was "magister utriusque militiæ" (*στρατηγὸς ἑκατέρας δυνάμεως*) under Attalus, Atawulf was "comes domesticorum equitum" (*ἡγεμὼν τῶν ἱππέων δομεστίκων καλουμένων*), Sôzomen, ix. 8. Atawulf now doubtless held the higher place.

received from him the post of count of the private largesses. The post was not a pleasing one, as Attalus had no revenues from which to be bountiful. Yet he submitted; it was the will of the Goth; the rule of the Goth was a fact in Aquitaine, and many Romans had learned how to flourish under it *.

The Augustus of Bourdeaux and Narbonne had thus a strong helper of another people; but the Augustus of Ravenna had found a strong helper among his own people. Constantius was now the counsellor of Honorius; and Constantius could act as well as counsel. The man who had lost Placidia

* Paulinus, 292;

"Addita majoris nova est quoque causa laboris,
Ut me conquirens solatia vana tyrannus
Attalus absentem casso onoraret honoris
Nomine, privatæ comitivam largitionis
Dans mihi, quam sciret nullo consistere censu;
Jamque suo ipse etiam dedisset fidem regno,
Solis quippe Gothis fretus male jam sibi notis
Quos ad præsidium vitæ præsentis habere
Non etiam imperii poterat per se nihil ipse,
Aut opibus propriis aut ullo milite nixus.
Unde ego non partes infirmi omnino tyranni,
Sed Gothicam fateor pacem me esse secutum,
Quæ tunc ipsorum consensu optata Gothorum,
Paulo post aliis cessit mercede redempta,
Nec penitenda manet cum jam in republica nostra
Cernamus plures Gothico florere favore."

It is to be hoped that Paulinus' Greek verses, if he made any, were better than his Latin. I do not profess to understand every word, and the last lines seem to refer to a later time when the Goths were in full possession of Aquitaine. But the general sense must be much as I have given it in the text, and in any case we see a "Pax Gothica" supplanting the "Pax Romana."

was sent, with the new rank of Patrician, against the man who had won her. Constantius entered Gaul; if Boniface, with only public motives for action, had once proved too strong for Atawulf, much more might Constantius, with his own quarrel to stir him to yet further zeal. So it proved. Roman military science, when combined, as it was in the case of the new Patrician, with a stout heart and a strong arm and a private grudge to boot, proved too skilful for the simpler valour of the Goth. Boniface had saved Marseilles from Atawulf; Constantius now succeeded in driving him out of all Gaul, and that, if we rightly understand the somewhat dark language of our authorities, without any actual fighting. The work seems to have been done by skilful combinations which cut off the Gothic host from the coast and all supplies. While Constantius kept his own head-quarters at Arles, he constrained Atawulf to depart from Narbonne and from the whole land *. Again

* At this point Olympiodôros fails us. Prosper only speaks casually of "Gothi ad Hispanias migrantes." Idatius speaks of "Ataulfus a patricio Constantio pulsatus, ut relicta Narbona Hispanias peteret." It is from Orosius that we get the nearest approach to an account of the campaign; "Constantius comes apud Arelatum Galliæ urbem subsistens magna rerum gerundarum industria Gothos a Narbona expulit, atque abire in Hispaniam cogit, interdicto præcipue et intercluso omni conatu navium et peregrinorum usu commerciorum Gothos."

Jordanis (Getica, 31) has quite another story. Franks, Burgundians, Vandals, Alans, all flee out of Gaul for fear of the Goths, and take refuge in Spain. Atawulf follows them, and at the end of three years is master of Gaul and Spain both. "Tali ergo casu Galliæ Atauulfo paterna venienti. Confirmato ergo Gothus regno in Galliis Spanorum casu cœpit dolere, eosque deliberans a Vanda-

we get some details of great interest and singularity, from the poet of the Eucharisticon. The Goths had entered Bourdeaux in peace, and they had kept peace in it; but when Atawulf was driven to leave Gaul, and his bidding came that his army was to leave the city, they did not leave it in peace. Attalus was still acknowledged by Atawulf as Emperor, and, according to this theory, whatever Constantius might be doing at Arles, the people of Bourdeaux were harmless subjects of a prince in alliance with the Gothic King, and were therefore entitled to the full protection of the Gothic peace. But at such a moment rage and disappointment trampled on all such subtleties as this. The Goths were giving way before Roman enemies; they had a Roman city in their power; and, though they had entered it as friends and had dwelled in it as friends, yet, when they had to leave it against their wills, they dealt with it as if it had been taken by storm. Whether at the bidding of Atawulf or not, Bourdeaux was plundered and burned—burned that is doubtless in the way that cities were burned, and from which they so speedily recovered *. The count of the

lorum cursibus eripere, suas opes Barcilona cum certis fidelibus derelictas plebeque imbelli, interiores Spanias introivit, ubi sæpe cum Vandalis decertans, tertio anno postquam Gallias Spaniasque domuisset, occubuit." Here must surely be a confusion between Atawulf and Wallia.

* Paulinus, 308;

"Tristia quæque tamen perpessis antea multis
Pars ego magna fui quorum privatus et ipse,
Cunctis quippe bonis propriis patriæque superstes,
Namque profecturi regis præcepto Ataulfi,

largesses fared no better than others, or rather worse. His privilege of having no Goth quartered in his house now turned to his loss. Not a few others found the horrors of the sack much lessened by the personal kindness of their Gothic guests; Paulinus had no such friend to help him*. His rank as the minister of an allied prince went for nothing; his goods were plundered; his house was burned; he, his mother, and his household, escaped with the loss of all. They were fain to be thankful that they were spared in life and limb, and that the chaste Goths, true to their picture as drawn by Salvian, did no wrong to the honour of any of the female members of the company †.

> Nostra ex urbe Gothi fuerant qui in pace recepti,
> Non aliter nobis quam belli jure subactis
> Aspera quæque omni urbe irrogavere cremata."

The "præfecturus rex Ataulfus" clearly points to the departure of Atawulf into Spain. In so confused a writer we may hope that the "præceptus" referred only to the departure and not to the sack of Bourdeaux.

* Paulinus, 286 (after the lines quoted, p. 204, note);

> "Quod post eventu cessit non sero sinistro:
> Nullo ut quippe domum speciali jure tuente
> Cederet in prædam populo permissa abeunti;
> Nam quosdam scimus summa humanitate Gothorum
> Hospitibus studuisse suis prodesse tuendis."

† Ib. 315;

> "In quam me inventum comitem tum principis ejus,
> Imperio cujus sociatos non sibi nôrant,
> Nudavere bonis simul omnibus, et genitricem
> Juxta meam mecum communi sorte subactos,
> Uno hoc se nobis credentes parcere captis,
> Quod nos immunes pœna paterentur abire,

All that Paulinus tells us about Bourdeaux is a distinct addition to our knowledge. But for him we should never have found out that the Gothic occupation under Atawulf stretched so far to the west. What follows is yet more remarkable, as it gives us our last glimpse on Gaulish soil of the vanishing race of the Alans, and of their relations towards the West-Goths. We are admitted to the personal acquaintance of an Alan king, who cannot fail to be that Goar of whom we have twice heard. He who had helped to set up Jovinus was now the fellow-soldier of the patron and officer of Attalus. Paulinus and his company, fleeing from Bourdeaux, made their way to Bazas, a city of Novempopulania, lying to the south-west of Bourdeaux, a little way off the left bank of the Garonne. This too was for Paulinus an ancestral city; if his descent from Ausonius was through his daughter, it was most likely the home of the family of Thalassius *. How he and his party were able to enter is not clear; for he found a strange state of things within and without the town. Without it was besieged by a mixed host of Goths and Alans,

> Cunctorumque tamen comitum simul et famulorum,
> Eventum fuerant nostrum quæcumque secutæ
> Illæso penitus, nullo adtemptante, pudore."

He is glad that his married daughter had left the country already.

* Ib. 328;

> "Nec postrema tamen tolerati meta laboris
> Ista fuit nostri quam diximus; illico namque
> Exacto laribus patriis tectisque crematis
> Obsidio hostilis vicina excepit in urbe
> Vasatis patria majorum et ipsa meorum."

minded clearly in their unwilling retreat to do all mischief that might be to the land which they were leaving. This is intelligible enough. Greater curiosity is awakened by Paulinus' picture of the internal state of Bazas. The slaves were in revolt, and a few young men of free birth—Catilina has his likeness in many times and places—joined with them in a conspiracy for the general slaughter of the nobles*. Are we, if the Bagaudæ were the mere *Jacquerie* that they are commonly painted, to suppose civic as well as rural Bagaudæ? But in any case it is not wonderful if the confusions that must have followed on successive barbaric invasions had stirred society to its lowest depths. Still servile conspiracies are seldom successful, and Bazas was not, any more than Armorica†, to be as Volsinii or as Hayti. The revolt was put down with the deaths of a few only of the guilty, and Paulinus is specially thankful to the Providence which allowed him the double satisfaction of forgiveness and of vengeance by causing the man who specially tried to murder him to be punished, but by the hand of another‡. But the

* Paulinus, 333;

"Et gravior multo, circumfusa hostilitate,
Factio servilis paucorum mixta furori
Insano juvenum . . . licet ingenuorum,
Armata in cædem specialem nobilitatis."

† See above, pp. 64, 168, 169.

‡ Paulinus, 337;

"Quæ tu, juste Deus, insonti a sanguine avertens,
Illico paucorum sedasti morte reorum,
Instantemque mihi specialem percussorem
Me ignorante alio jussisti ultore perire."

danger within the walls suggested to Paulinus a hazardous scheme of dealing with the besiegers who lay without them. He remembered his old friendship with the Alan king, and he knew that it was not of his own will that he and his people were serving with the Goths against the Romans. He contrived to make his way without hindrance to the camp of Goar, and asked that by his help he and his family might be allowed to leave the town. To the amazement of Paulinus, the Alan answered that he could not help him, that he could not even allow him to go back into Bazas, unless he were himself admitted into the town. He knew that, if the proposed escape were allowed, the wrath of the Goths would be heavy against Paulinus, while he, Goar, was anxious for an opportunity of escaping from Gothic supremacy*. The discourse between Paulinus

* Ib. 343;

"Sed mihi tam subiti concusso sorte pericli
Quo me intra urbem percelli posse viderem,
Subrepsit fateor nimium trepido novus error;
Consilio, ut me præsidio regis dudum mihi cari
Cujus nos populus longa obsidione premebat,
Urbe ab obsessa sperarem abscedere posse,
Agmine carorum magno comitante meorum,
Hac tamen hos nostros spe sollicitante paratus,
Quod scirem, imperio gentis cogente Gothorum,
Invitum regem populis incumbere nostris.
Explorandi igitur studio digressus ab urbe,
Ad regem intrepidus nullo obsistante petendi.
Lætior ante tamen prima quam affarer amicum,
Alloquio gratumque magis fore quam mihi rebar.
Perscrutato autem ut potui interius viri voto

and the Alan king is a little less clearly explained than we could have wished, but we may gather that Goar expressed his wish to change from the Gothic to the Roman side—or, if we like so to put it, from the side of Attalus to that of Honorius—and that he went within the walls of Bazas in company with Paulinus, in order to make a treaty to that effect with the chief men of the city. These were doubtless the members of the *curia*, the forefathers of those senatorial families who appear so often in the Gaulish history of the next century; in the days of Honorius political life seemed to be falling back into its original elements, and the senate of Bazas, like the senate of Rome, might be called to act for itself in matters of peace and war*. The agreement, whatever its exact terms, was made and carried

> Præsidium se posse mihi præstare negavit
> Extra urbem posito, nec tutus jam sibi prodens
> Ut visum remeare aliter pateretur ad urbem,
> Ipse nisi mecum mox susciperetur in urbe,
> Gnarus quippe Gothos rursum mihi dira minari,
> Seque ab ipsorum cupiens absolvere jure."

* Paulinus, 364;

> "Obstupui fateor pavefactus conditione
> Proposita et nimio indicti terrore pericli,
> Sed miserante Deo afflictis qui semper ubique
> Imploratus adest, paulo post mente resumpta,
> Ipse licet trepidus et adhuc nutantis amici
> Consilium audacter studui pro me ipse fovere,
> Ardua dissuadens quæ scirem omnino neganda,
> Præstanda et prius quam mox tentanda perurgens,
> Quæ non sero probans vir prudens ipse secutus,
> Illico consultis per se primatibus urbis,
> Rem cœptam accelerans una sub nocte peregit;

out. The wife and son of the Alan king were given to the Romans as hostages for his good faith. He and his people from the enemies became the friends of the Romans of Bazas, and they undertook to guard the city which they had the day before been besieging. But it would seem that they guarded it only from without. An unarmed crowd of both sexes, Paulinus himself, now restored to his friends, being doubtless among them, thronged the walls of Bazas to see the unexpected deliverers by whom they were set free from fear of the Gothic enemy. Close under the walls was the Alan host which had streamed together from all quarters, the women thronging along with their armed husbands. Bazas was closely fenced in by barbarian arms and barbarian waggons, but they were there for the protection and not for the assault of the town. When the Goths saw their army lessened by so important a part of it as their late Alan allies, they deemed that all hope of taking Bazas had passed from them. They marched away, by what exact course it did not concern Paulinus to tell us; but they must have made their way to join the army which had been driven to leave Narbonne. When the Gothic enemy was gone, the Alan deliverer did not long tarry; he too marched away, we know not whither; it is the last that we hear of Goar, the last that we hear of his people on Gaulish soil. Bazas was, for the moment at least, free from the presence alike of barbarian friends and

Auxiliante Deo cujus jam munus habebat,
Quo nobis populoque suo succurrere posset."

Does the last line but one imply that Goar was a Christian?

of barbarian enemies *. We should be glad of other such like tales of Gaulish towns during these memorable years. The Goth had now to withdraw, not only from Bourdeaux and Bazas, but from all Gaul;

* Paulinus, 377;

"Concurrit pariter cunctis ab sedibus omnis
Turba Alanaram armatis sociata maritis;
Prima uxor regis Romanis traditur obses,
Adjuncto pariter regis caro quoque nato.
Reddor et ipse meis pactæ inter fœdera pacis,
Communi tanquam Gothico salvatus ab hoste.
Vallanturque urbis pomœria milite Alano,
Acceptaque dataque fide certaret parato,
Pro nobis nuper quos ipse obsederat hostis.
Mira urbis facies cujus magna undique muros
Turba indiscreti sexus circumdat inermis.
Subjecta exterius; muris hærentia nostris
Agmina barbarica plaustris vallantur et armis,
Qui se truncatam parte agminis haud mediocris,
Circumjecta videns populorum turba Gothorum,
Illico diffidens tuto se posse morari
Hoste intestino subito in sua viscera verso,
Nil tentare ausa ulterius properanter abire,
Sponte sua legit cujus non sero secuti
Exemplum et nostri quos diximus auxiliares
Discessam fidem pacis servare parati
Romanis quoquo ipsos sors oblata tulisset."

I can hardly think with Fauriel (i. 134) that the line (381)

"Reddor et ipse meis pactæ inter fœdera pacis"

means that Paulinus was given up as a hostage to the Alans. But Fauriel is the only writer who has used the witness of Paulinus at any length. Dahn has some references. I doubt whether Gibbon had actually seen the poem.

The story of Paulinus goes on for forty years longer. It contains much interesting personal matter, and we shall have to turn to it once more for an illustration of general history.

Atawulf had to give up all immediate hopes of dominion north of the Pyrenees. He and his Goths passed into Spain. He took with him his puppet Emperor and his Roman queen, the sister of the lawful Augustus of whom he was now again the enemy.

This was a strange moment in the strangely chequered career of Placidia. As far as Romania was concerned, she had sunk into nothingness. She was a banished woman among a strange folk, a folk at war with her house, and if not formally at war with her country, yet kept from being so only because they had set up the enemy of her house as the nominal ruler of her country. As far as Gothia was concerned, she was the wife of a loving husband, the queen of a mighty king, the royal lady of what still seemed to be a loyal people. An exile from Rome and Ravenna, she had come to share a kingly throne, if only the throne of a barbarian, in the elder home of the Theodosian house. And presently it seemed as if the line of Theodosius and the line of the Balts were to be alike continued in a common representative of Gothia and Romania. At Barcelona, the new seat of her husband's power, Placidia bore a son (415) who might look to be one day heaved on the shield as a Gothic king, and to wear the diadem of his childless uncle in the palace of Ravenna and on the capitol of Rome. The babe received the name of his Roman grandfather, and the birth of the youngest Theodosius seemed to open a way towards a reconciliation between the families and the nations of his parents. Both Atawulf and

Placidia sought for peace and friendship with Honorius *. The claims of Attalus were again forgotten; whether he was actually sent to Italy as a peace-offering is not quite clear; anyhow he was cast aside by the Goths; he was taken at sea by officers of Honorius, delivered up to Constantius, and kept for the judgement of the lawful Emperor. Between Honorius and the first Cæsar the likeness is not great; yet the fate of Attalus has something in common with the fate of Vercingetorix. Each kept his captive to adorn his triumph; for two years after this time (417) Honorius again entered Rome with the ancient ceremonies of a conqueror. Attalus was, like Perseus, Jugurtha, or Tetricus, led before the triumphal chariot, but as he escaped the fate of Vercingetorix, he escaped also the harder fate of Jugurtha. Gaius Julius could slay, but he did not mutilate, nor did he, like Gaius Marius, condemn the victim to a lingering death. Honorius could

* Olympiodôros, p. 258; Ἀδάουλφος, τεχθέντος αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς Πλακιδίας παιδὸς, ᾧ ἐπέθετο κλῆσιν Θεοδόσιον, πλέον ἠσπάζετο τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους φιλίαν. He does not mention Attalus at this point.

Orosius, who records the marriage of Atawulf and Placidia, but not the birth of Theodosius, brings out Atawulf's desire for peace very strongly, and attributes it largely to Placidia's influence; "Is, ut supra auditum atque ultimo exitu ejus probatum est, satis studiosæ sectator pacis, militare fideliter Honorio imperatori ac pro defendenda Romana republica impendere vires Gothorum præoptavit." And afterwards—the great passage of all comes between—"Ob hoc abstinere a bello, ob hoc inhiare paci, nitebatur, præcipue Placidiæ uxoris suæ, feminæ sane ingenio acerrimæ et religionis satis probatæ, ad omnia bonarum ordinationum opera persuasu et consilio temperatus."

slay also on occasion; but he could also mutilate. He might have a special temptation to choose that punishment in the case of Attalus. There had been a day when Attalus had threatened Honorius with mutilation and banishment to an island *. He was himself to feel in himself what he had thought of for another. His head was not sent to keep company with the heads of so many tyrants at Carthage or elsewhere. Among the ceremonies of the triumph he was led before the tribunal of the conqueror, and then, with the loss only of the thumb and one other finger of his right hand, a disqualification alike for the lyre and for the sceptre, he was sent to end his days on one of the fiery isles of Æolus †.

* See next page.

† We read in Prosper, 415, "Attalus a Gothis ad Hispanias migrantibus neglectus et præsidio carens, capitur et Constantio patricio vivus offertur." And again in 417, "Honorius triumphans Romam ingreditur, præeunte currum ejus Attalo, quem Liparæ vivere exsulem jussit." Orosius, without any distinct date, as the fate of Attalus is brought in rhetorically along with the ends of the other tyrants—"Attalus tamque inane imperii simulacrum cum Gothis usque ad Hispanias portatus est, unde discedens navi, incerta moliens, in mari captus et ad Constantium comitem deductus, deinde imperatori Honorio exhibitus truncata manu vitæ relictus est." This is followed by Marcellinus, 412, who puts the date back through coupling Jovinus and Attalus. He says, "Attalus in mari captus atque Honorio exhibitus, truncata manu vitæ relictus est." Nor can I, with Clinton, agree to put the surrender of Attalus in 416 along with the restoration of Placidia. This comes from the passage in Philostorgius, xii. 4; ἐκ τούτου [on the death of Atawulf] τὸ βάρβαρον πρὸς Ὀνώριον σπένδεται, καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν ἀδελφὴν καὶ τὸν Ἄτταλον τῷ βασιλεῖ παρεντίθενται αὐτοί. But he is clearly writing without regard to minute chronology,

The offering of Attalus, if an offering he was, might appease the offended dignity of Honorius; it did not appease the bitter jealousy of Constantius. No peace would he have with the husband of Placidia, the father of Placidia's child *. A strange doom presently transferred those titles to himself, and led the sister of Honorius to a higher throne than that of the West-Goths. But her path to her highest elevation was through deeper sorrow than ever. To become Augusta, wife and mother of Augusti, she had to go through heavy bereavement and harsher captivity. Before the year was out,

as he adds, *μοῖράν τινα τῆς Γαλατῶν χώρας εἰς γεωργίαν ἀποκληρωσάμενοι.* This can mean only the Aquitanian cession, for which Clinton's date is 418. Prosper's order of events is on the other hand clear and careful, and it is hardly set aside by the Paschal Chronicle (i. 573, ed. Bonr.) which places *τὰ ἐπινίκια τὰ κατὰ Ἄτταλον τὸν τύραννον* in the consulship of Theodosius (VII) and Palladius, that is 416. Olympiodôros (452) mentions the fate of Attalus casually, when recording his first elevation; *μετὰ χρόνον τινα βασιλεύει. εἶτα καθαιρεῖται, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὕστερον ἐπὶ Ῥάβενναν παραγεγονὼς, καὶ τοὺς τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρὸς δακτύλους ἀκρωτηριασθεὶς ἐξορίᾳ παραπέμπεται.* The mutilation however was clearly done, not at Ravenna but at Rome among the ceremonies of the triumph. Philostorgius (xii.) gives some curious details; *ὑπὲρ τοῦ βήματος ἀναβὰς* [Ὀνώριος], *ὁ τὴν πρώτην αὐτῷ βαθμίδα τὸν Ἄτταλον διαβαίνειν ὑπετίθει . . . . δεξιᾶς χειρὸς ἀπέτεμε τοὺς δύο δακτύλους, ὧν ὁ μὲν ἀντιχεὶρ, ὁ δὲ λίχανος ἔχει τὴν κλῆσιν. καὶ εἰς Λιπάραν τὴν νῆσον τοῦτον φυγαδεύει, μηδενὸς ἄλλου κακοῦ πρὸς πεῖραν καταστήσας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς εἰς τὸν βίον χρείας παρασχόμενος.* It must be remembered that Attalus had once threatened Honorius with banishment to an island, and that either he or Jovius—more likely Jovius—had added the threat of mutilation. Cf. Olymp. p. 452, with Zôsimos, vi. 9.

* Olymp. p. 458; *Κωνσταντίου δὲ καὶ τῶν περὶ Κωνστάντιον ἀντιπραττόντων, ἔμενεν ἄπρακτος ἡ τούτου καὶ Πλακιδίας ὁρμή.*

Constantius might rejoice that the son and the husband of his beloved were taken away out of his path, and that without any crime on his part. The infant Theodosius, born to be the hope of two nations and the tie between two periods of the world's history, died to the deep grief of both his parents, and was buried in a casket of silver in a church outside the walls of Barcelona *. The death of the father (415) soon followed on the death of the child. Atawulf had foes of his own nation. Some told how a certain Eoforwulf could not endure the king's jeers at his small stature. Others told how in times past a king of some branch of the Gothic folk had been slain at Atawulf's bidding, how his faithful follower, Dubius by name, cherished vengeance for his slain lord, and one day gave Atawulf a deadly wound, as the King was going the round of his horses†. Atawulf

* Ib. 459; *τελευτήσαντος τοῦ παιδὸς, πένθος μέγα ποιοῦσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ καὶ θάπτουσιν ἐν λάρνακι καταθέντες ἀργυρᾷ πρὸ τῆς Βαρκέλλωνος ἔν τινι εὐκτηρίῳ.* This last phrase of *bedehouse*, is perhaps a sign of the probable paganism of Olympiodôros. Anyhow it is an early case of burial inside a church. The American use of "casket" seems exactly to translate *λάρναξ*.

† This is the story in Jordanis, Getica, 31; "Occubuit gladio ilia perforata Euerwulfi, de cujus solitus erat ridere statura." Olympiodôros says; *ἀναιρεῖται Ἀδάουλφος, εἰς ἐπιτήρησιν τῶν οἰκείων ἵππων, ὡς εἴθιστο αὐτῷ, διατρίβων ἐν τῷ ἱππῶνι. ἀναιρεῖ δὲ αὐτὸν εἷς τῶν οἰκείων Γότθων, Δούβιος τοὔνομα, ἔχθραν παλαιὰν καιροφυλακήσας· πάλαι γὰρ ἦν ὁ τούτου δεσπότης, μοίρας Γοτθικῆς ῥὴξ, ὑπὸ Ἀδαούλφου ἀνῃρημένος· ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὸν Δούβιον λαβὼν Ἀδάουλφος ᾠκειώσατο· ὁ δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ δεσπότῃ ἀμύνων τὸν δεύτερον διεχρήσατο.* I agree with Mr. Hodgkin, i. 415, that the former lord cannot be Sarus. But may not the *Δούβιος* of Olympiodôros and the Euerwulfus—clearly Eoforwulf, a grand wild beast name—of Jordanis be the same?

died, but not till he had given his dying charge to a brother. A childless widow among a strange folk, there was no longer a place for Placidia in the Gothic camp; Atawulf could bring himself to bid that she should be given back to her own people, even at the risk of handing her over to the arms of his rival. And, to the last faithful to his mission, the Gothic King, the beginner of the world of modern Europe, died with a worthy bidding on his lips. The last words of Atawulf were the counsel that his Goths should ever dwell, if so it might be, in peace and friendship with the Romans *.

A king of a moment followed Atawulf, the successor whom Atawulf would have least wished to follow him. Deep in the next century men in other Teutonic kingdoms remarked on the little regard which the Goths showed to the claims of birth in disposing of their crown. They had an evil practice, so it seemed

Δούβιος does not sound like a Gothic name—unless one could fancy something like *Dubba*—and it might be a Latin nickname.

Philostorgius (xii. 2) brings in the death of Atawulf with a singular phrase; *οὐ πολὺ τὸ μέσον καὶ πολλὰ δραματουργήσας ἐξ ὀργῆς Ἀδάουλφος ὑπό τινος τῶν οἰκείων ἀποσφάττεται.* Orosius laments his being cut off while he was so earnestly striving for peace; "Cumque eidem paci petendæ atque offerendæ studiosissime insisteret, apud Barchilonem Hispaniæ urbem dolo suorum, ut fertur, occisus est." Idatius, who places the death of Atawulf in 416, has a singular phrase; "per quemdam Gothum apud Barcelonam inter familiares fabulas jugulatur." Does that mean a friendly chat in the stable?

* Olympiodôros, 459; *τελευτῶν δὲ Ἀδάουλφος προσέταττε τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀδελφῷ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν Πλακιδίαν καὶ, εἴτι δύναιντο, τὴν Ῥωμαίων φιλίαν ἑαυτοῖς περιποιήσασθαι.* This brother does not seem to be spoken of elsewhere.

in Frankish Gaul, of killing their kings, and setting up whom they would in their place *. Nobility of birth, the lofty stock of the Balti and the Amali, was indeed respected among both Eastern and Western Goths; but in the succession to the Gothic crowns we see neither the Frankish rule which deemed that every son of a king had a right to be a king nor yet the English rule by which the nation chose for itself among the kingly house. Atawulf had left children and a brother; but some strange passing influence gave for one week the *cynehelm* of the West-Goths to Sigeric the brother of the slain Sarus. A party favourable to his house and hostile to the house of Atawulf already had the upper hand for the moment †. We are told that Sigeric, no less than Atawulf, sought for peace with Rome; but it is more certain that he treated the widowed sister of the Emperor with the deepest insult. Placidia, mourning for her child, mourning for her husband, was forced to walk undistinguished

* Greg. Tur. iii. 30; "Sumpserant enim Gothi hanc detestabilem consuetudinem, ut si quis eis de regibus non placuisset, gladio eum adpeterent, et qui libuisset animo, hunc sibi statuerent regem."

† "Segericus rex a Gothis creatur," says Orosius; the name is one of a familiar type. In Greek hands it changes a little; as Olympidôros says; *διάδοχος ὁ τοῦ Σάρου ἀδελφὸς Σιγγέριχος, σπουδῇ μᾶλλον καὶ δυναστείᾳ ἢ ἀκολουθίᾳ καὶ νόμῳ γίνεται.* This is again a curious use of the word *δυναστεία*. The fate of the children is emphatically marked by Olympiodôros; *τά τε παιδία ἃ ἐκ τῆς ἑτέρας γυναικὸς ἐτύγχανεν Ἀδαούλφῳ γεγενημένα, ἀνεῖλε, βίᾳ τῶν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Σιγησάρου κόλπων ἀποσπάσας.* Then follows the treatment of Placidia—*εἰς ὕβριν Ἀδαούλφου.* See Hodgkin, i. 835.

Jordanis also (Getica, 31) records the election and death of Sigeric. In the chronicles his short dominion passes without notice. Wallia would seem to have immediately succeeded Atawulf.

among a crowd of captives who were driven before the horse of Sigeric. Her step-children, the brood of the Sarmatian woman, were torn from the arms of the Bishop Sigesar, a Goth and an Arian, and slaughtered without mercy. But on the seventh day the murderer was himself slain, and a worthier choice was now made. Wallia, the wise and valiant, was heaved on the shield. We hear nothing of his descent or of his earlier deeds; but what he did in a short reign showed that he had well learned the lesson of Atawulf. The great hindrance to peace, the personal rivalry between Atawulf and Constantius, was now at an end. We know nothing of the domestic relations of Wallia at the time, but he at least did not give Placidia a third suitor. She was given back to her brother, Constantius being the officer whose duty it was to receive her, and the Goths received the long-promised payment of corn in exchange *. The memory of her noble Goth

* Olympiodôros says of Sigeric, *ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ἄρξας, ἀναιρεῖται, ἡγεμὼν δὲ τῶν Γότθων Οὐαλίας καθίσταται.* In a later extract (p. 462) he records the restoration of Placidia with some details which are not found elsewhere, especially the payment of the wheat;

Εὐπλούτιος ὁ μαγιστριανὸς πρὸς Οὐαλίαν, ὃς τῶν Γότθων ἐχρημάτιζε φύλαρχος, ἀποστέλλεται, ἐφ' ᾧ σπονδάς τε θέσθαι εἰρηνικὰς καὶ ἀπολαβεῖν τὴν Πλακιδίαν. ὁ δὲ ἑτοίμως δέχεται, καὶ ἀποσταλέντος αὐτῷ σίτου ἐν μυριάσιν ἑξήκοντα, ἀπολύεται Πλακιδία παραδοθεῖσα Εὐπλουτίῳ πρὸς Ὀνώριον τὸν οἰκεῖον αὐτῆς ἀδελφόν.

Orosius records the death of Sigeric and the election of Wallia, and adds, somewhat later; "Pacem optimam cum Honorio imperatore datis tutissimis obsidibus pepigit. Placidiam imperatoris sororem honorifice apud se honesteque habitam fratri reddidit."

Philostorgius (xii. 4) records the payment of corn; but he is

lived in her heart, but she at last became the unwilling bride of the man who had so long waited for her. Constantius, count, patrician, consul, held for seven months the rank of Augustus, and even in that short space learned that the diadem did not bring happiness *. Placidia Augusta, mother of Honoria, saw her daughter, if not wedded, yet wooed, by a barbarian of another stamp from her own Atawulf. Attila claimed her as his; but at least the blood of Emperors did not actually mingle with the blood of the Hun. Mother of the last Valentinian, the last Roman prince who could claim even female

in rather a hurry about Aquitaine, as he is rather too late with Attalus; ἐκ τούτου [on the death of Atawulf] τὸν βάρβαρον πρὸς Ὀνώριον σπένδεται [Κωνστάντιος seemingly] καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν ἀδελφὴν, καὶ τὸν Ἀτταλοῦ τῷ βασιλεῖ παρατίθενται αὐτοὶ, σιτήσεσί τε δεξιουθέντες, καὶ μοῖραν τινὰ τῆς τῶν Γαλατῶν χώρας εἰς γεωργίαν ἀποκληρωσάμενοι. Prosper's entry is a little mysterious; "Athaulfus a quodam suorum vulneratus interiit, regnumque ejus Wallia, *peremptis qui idem cupere intelligebantur*, invasit." The words in Italics are an odd way of pointing at Sigeric. Under the next year, 416, his entry is, "Placidiam Theodosii imperatoris filiam, quam Romæ Gothi ceperant, quamque Ataulfus conjugem habuerat, Wallia pacem Honorii expetens reddit, ejusque nuptias Constantius promeretur."

In this last entry he also is in too great a hurry.

* Idatius records the marriage; but he places it in the same year with her restoration and with the death of Atawulf. Olympiodôros (p. 464) fixes it to the first day of the eleventh consulship of Honorius and second of Constantius, that is to January 1, 417. He brings out the unwillingness of Placidia very strongly; πολλὰ μὲν αὐτὴ ἀνανεύουσα παρεσκεύασε καὶ τῶν αὐτῆς ὀργίζεσθαι θεραπόντων. τέλος δὲ ἐν τῇ τῆς ὑπατείας ἡμέρᾳ ἀπὸ χειρὸς ταύτην ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἀδελφὸς Ὀνώριος ἄκουσαν λαβὼν, ἐγχειρίζει παραδοὺς Κωνσταντίῳ.

descent from the stock of Theodosius, she knew exile and she knew rule. Her memory still lives among the columns and mosaics of Ravenna; it is but a few centuries since she was there in her bodily presence *.

The reign of Wallia forms the last stage of our story (415–419). He was the direct founder of the Gothic power in Gaul; he was the indirect founder of the more famous, but hardly in truth more memorable, Gothic power in Spain. At him and his works and the works of those who followed him we must at least look so far as to see the West-Gothic kingdom definitely change from a wandering people to an established territorial power. That power has, beyond all others, a threefold position. It was the Goth who was called, in the forefront of all the nations of Western Europe, to bear the assault of the Saracen, to bridge over the time when the strife was between the older and the newer life of Europe, between the elder power of Rome and the younger power of the Turk, and the time when both had to strive against wholly alien foes from Africa and Asia. Into those days it is not our present business to follow him; but we must see this power established in the lands in which we have as yet seen him only as a wanderer. Of the three lands whose revolutions during some most eventful years we have undertaken to trace, Britain has passed away into a world

* On the tomb of Placidia and her embalmed body, which sat there in Imperial state till late in the sixteenth century, see the various accounts of Ravenna and Hodgkin, i. 887, 888.

of fable to come forth again into the world of history under a guise wholly unlike that of either of her fellows. In Spain and Gaul we have still to see some shadow of a return to settled order brought about by the sword of the West-Goth.

VI.

[WALLIA AND THE SETTLEMENT OF AQUITAINE.]

WALLIA, King of the West-Goths, is one of the men to whom we may be inclined to think that later ages have hardly done justice. The dispensing of historic fame is always liable to be somewhat accidental; it was specially so in the times with which we are now dealing. Our actual narratives are so painfully meagre and piecemeal; and it is so purely a matter of chance whether any other record of this or that prince or other leading man happens to be preserved. We can hardly fancy that the glory of the great Theodoric could ever have been wholly obscured or brought down to the level of an ordinary barbarian king. Yet from direct narrative we should know hardly anything of his Italian reign; we should know far more—that is, if any human effort could remember the story—of the endless intrigues in which he and his namesake figured while the East-Goth still abode on the eastern side of the Hadriatic. It is to the good luck that has preserved to us the whole mass of the state-papers of one of the most memorable of reigns that we owe that, though there are few kings whose reigns it would be harder to record in detail in the shape of annals, there are few whom we can more fully call up in every detail of

his internal government and his foreign policy. A lesser, but not contemptible bearer of his name, stands before us as a living man and not a mere name in a chronicle, because our prelate and poet at Auvergne has by good luck drawn us the full-length portrait of a neighbour whom he dreaded but whom he could not help respecting *. Of Atawulf himself, of the clear sight with which he spanned the ages, of the keen grasp with which he learned the place in the world's history that was meant for him, we should have had but the faintest glimmerings, if a citizen of Narbonne had not told the tale to a saint at Bethlehem in the hearing of a pilgrim from Tarragona. On Wallia Orosius has bestowed only a few lines of narrative prose, while Sidonius has bestowed on him the chance gift of a casual mention, taking to be sure the shape of a few sounding hexameters, enough perhaps for a barbarian king, in the long panegyric with which he hails a short-lived Emperor †. We can judge of him only by his acts, as they are recorded in the meagre materials out of which we have to patch his story. In them he stands forth as the worthy successor of Atawulf, as the man who carried on the work of Atawulf, as the Goth wielding his sword in the cause of Rome, as the prince who found a settled dwelling-place for his people, who established Gothia as a known part of the earth's surface, and that without wiping out Romania to make room for it. Wallia waged many wars; but he waged them all, according to the teaching of

* See the picture of the second Theodoric in Sidonius, i. 2.

† Sidonius, Carm. ii. 363, &c.

Atawulf, as the soldier of the Empire. It is said by one who was writing while Wallia was acting that Wallia was chosen to the West-Gothic kingship in order that he might be the enemy of the Empire, but that he really showed himself its faithful friend *. We see here either a change of purpose in Wallia himself, like the change of purpose which we have seen in Atawulf, or else a difference of objects between Wallia and his people, in which the warlike instincts of the nation submitted in the end to the direction given to them by the King. It seems certain that the first enterprise which Wallia designed was a direct attack on the lands of the Empire, on a province which had been spared invasion for many years. Wallia proposed to forestall with his Goths the work which Gaiseric afterwards carried out with his Vandals, to pass the bounds of Europe and to found a Teutonic dominion in Africa which could have been founded only at the expense of Rome. It was the second time during these wars and settlements that the Goths, after so long a history as a nation ever moving by land, ventured, as they had once done so long before, to risk their fate on the waters of the Mediterranean. Alaric, flushed with the spoils of Rome, had designed to brave Skylla and Charybdis and to make Sicily, perhaps a Gothic dominion, perhaps only a field for

* So at least says Orosius, vii. 43; "Segericus rex a Gothis creatus cum itidem judicio Dei ad pacem pronus esset, nihilominus a suis interfectus est. Deinde Vallia successit in regnum, ad hoc electus a Gothis ut pacem infringeret, ad hoc ordinatus a Deo ut pacem confirmaret."

Gothic plunder. The dangers of the strait had been too much for him, and the Gothic fleet was dashed in pieces *. So now Wallia, as the firstfruits of his reign, gathered a fleet to bear his warriors to their African conquest; but his enterprise shared the fate of that of his predecessor; another Gothic fleet was dashed in pieces by a mighty storm in the narrow sea between the pillars of Hêraklês †. Then Wallia thought of the ill luck of Alaric; he learned that destiny did not design him and his people for warfare with Rome or for warfare on the sea. He would keep himself to the element on which his people had done great things and would there act as the ally and soldier of Rome. He gladly listened to the advances of the Roman envoy Euplutius, and the peace was concluded between Wallia and the patrician Constantius ‡. He is

* See the strange story of the image in Olympiodôros, 453.

† Orosius, vii. 43; "Territus maxime judicio Dei, quia cum magna superiore abhinc anno Gothorum manus instructa armis navigiisque transire in Africam moliretur, in duodecim millibus passuum Gaditani freti tempestate correpta, miserabili exitu perierat, memor etiam illius acceptæ sub Alarico cladis, cum in Siciliam Gothi transire conati, in conspectu suorum miserabiliter arrepti et demersi sunt."

‡ Ib.; "Pacem optimam cum Honorio imperatore datis lectissimis obsidibus pepigit." So Idatius, who places it in the twenty-second year of Honorius, that is 416; "Cui [Ataulfo] succedens Wallia in regno cum patricio Constantio pace mox facta." So Prosper speaks of "Wallia pacem Honorii expetens" in the consulship of Theodosius VII. and Palladius; that is also 416. This seems to be the right year for the peace and the restoration of Placidia. Only Prosper has put her second marriage too early, and Idatius has put the death of Atawulf too late.

The name of the negotiator comes from Olympiodôros (462);

named as the actor; and to him the peace was specially interesting, as it was the peace by which Placidia was at last restored to her countryman, and the way opened for her marriage with himself. In the wider view of things this peace—*pax optima* as it is called by the devout Orosius—was marked by the engagement made by the Goths to win back Spain to the obedience of the Empire from the dominion of the Vandals, Suevians, and Alans, by whom so large a part of it was still possessed. If the Vandals really had made a treaty with the Empire, it went for nothing when so promising an alliance offered itself, and one which so much better suited the personal objects of Constantius*. In observance of his new engagements, Wallia, during his short reign, waged many wars in Spain, but always to the at least nominal advantage of the Empire. Yet it is hard to believe, though our authority is the absolutely contemporary Orosius, who recorded the exploits of Wallia in his own land as the best news of the day, that either Wallia or the barbarian king generally sent messages to the Emperor, setting forth the state of things with

Εὐπλούτιος ὁ μαγιστριανὸς πρὸς Οὐαλίαν, ὃς τῶν Γότθων ἐχρημάτιζε φύλαρχος, ἀποστέλλεται, ἐφ' ᾧ σπονδάς τε θέσθαι εἰρηνικὰς καὶ ἀπολαβεῖν τὴν Πλακιδίαν, κ. τ. λ. Wallia is φύλαρχος again in 465; he was ἡγεμών in 659.

* On this peace see Dahn, i. 145. Procopius (Bell. Vand. i. 3) makes an agreement between Honorius and Godegisl (τότε ξυμβαίνει Γοδιγίσκλῳ Ὀνώριος ἐφ' ᾧ δὴ οὐκ ἐπὶ λύμῃ τῆς χώρας ἱδρύσονται). But Godegisl had been killed long before; see above, p. 28. Orosius also seems to refer to something of the kind in words which will be quoted in the next note.

a plainness of speech unusual among the princes of any age. Let Honorius, he is made to say, abide at peace, and take hostages from all; in the war between him and the other barbarians, whichever side won, whichever side was overthrown, the loss was the loss of barbarians, the gain in any case would belong to the Emperor and the Republic*. With or without this clear understanding of what he was doing, Wallia set forth to bring back that part of Spain which was in the hands of the newly settled barbarian powers, that is to say, all the peninsula save the Roman corner in the north-east and the few points which still held out elsewhere. Of these powers two were broken in pieces, that one most utterly which seemed most thoroughly out of place. Non-Aryan invaders were not to rule abidingly in Western Europe till they came in quite another shape from that of the half-Teutonized Turanian.

* Idatius (Roncalli, vol. i. p. 19) is emphatic on this head; "Wallia rex Gothorum Romani nominis causa intra Hispanias cædes magnas efficit barbarorum." Orosius, vii. 43, adds some strange details; "Romanæ securitati periculum suum obtulit [Wallia] ut adversus cæteras gentes quæ per Hispanias consedissent sibi pugnaret, et Romanis vinceret; *quamvis Halanorum cæteri Vandalorum Suevorumque reges eodem nobiscum placito despecti* [al. depecti] *forent*, mandantes imperatori Honorio; Tu cum omnibus pacem habe omniumque obsides accipe: nos nobiscum confligimus; nobis perimus, tibi vincimus: immortali vero quæstu erit reipublicæ tuæ si utrique pereamus. Quis hæc crederet, nisi res doceret?" How strictly contemporary Orosius was comes out strongly in the words that follow; "Itaque nunc quotidie apud Hispanias geri bella gentium et agi strages ex alterutro barbarorum crebris certisque nuntiis discimus, præcipue Valliam Gothorum regem insistere patrandæ paci ferunt."

At that moment the Alans were the greatest power of central Spain, cut off indeed from the straits and from the Pyrenees, but stretching from the Ocean to the inner sea, from the haven of Odysseus to the haven of Asdrubal. Their dominion has on the map almost the air of a kingdom of Castile with a kingdom of Portugal added. To the north-west the Suevians under Hermenrich and the Asdingian Vandals under Guntheric between them held the Gallician horn of Europe; south of Anas the Silingian Vandals held the land of Bætica, the land to which some have thought that they gave their name. The mountainous frontier of Gaul, and the land on either side of Ebro, the land of Tarraco and Cæsaraugusta, was still held, either by the Roman or by those whom neither Roman nor Saracen could fully overcome. To enlarge this Imperial remnant at the cost of all the settlers of the last few years, the sword of Wallia was now drawn. The Alans, under their king Atax, were so utterly overthrown that they ceased to be a people and a kingdom; the remnant that escaped from the Goth commended themselves to the Vandal King Guntheric, and lost themselves in the greater mass of his people. Here the report of the contemporary annalist is borne out by later history. The Alans now vanish from Spanish history. It is more startling when the same author says that the Silingian Vandals in Bætica were all cut off by King Wallia. For that is just the corner of Spain in which the Vandal power lived on till its voluntary departure beyond the straits, and where it showed not a little vigour

a few years after this time. A contemporary Spaniard must be supposed to know the geography of his own country; and, if we allow for somewhat of exaggeration, if we grant the survival of a remnant which was capable of again becoming a great people by the immigration of a kindred folk, the statement becomes intelligible. We have an entry a little earlier by which it seems that a Vandal king, Frithbald by name, was taken and sent as a trophy to Honorius. But as he was taken by craft without dealing of handstrokes, we may be tempted to guess that those who took him were Romans rather than Goths*. Anyhow, as long as

* Our accounts of these wars are very meagre. The clearest account is that of Idatius. After the entry in note, p. 229, placed in 416, come the words "Alanis et Wandalis Silingis in Lusitania et Bætica sedentibus adversatur [Wallia]." Then comes under the same year, only seemingly with some doubt as to the manuscript authority;

"Fredbalum regem gentis Wandalorum sine ullo certamine ingeniose captum ad imperatorem Honorium destinat."

(The nominative seems to be Constantius, whose marriage comes just before. Only that was certainly in the next year, 417. Honorio XI. et Constantio II. Coss.)

Then comes the entry quoted in note, p. 231, under the year 417 (Honorius XXIV.). Then in the same year;

"Wandali Silingi in Bætica per Walliam regem omnes extincti.

"Alani qui Wandalis et Suevis potentabantur, adeo cæsi sunt a Gothis, ut, exstincto Addace rege ipsorum, pauci qui superfuerant, abolito regni nomine, Gunderici regis Wandalorum qui in Gallæcia resederat, se patrocinio subjugarent."

One finds less help than one looked for in Pallmann, Geschichte der Völkerwanderung, i. 259, and Dahn, Könige der Germanen, v. 56. Wietersheim (Band iv. 178–180) brings out more points in a few words.

Wallia remained in Spain, the Gothic sword, wielded, according to the bidding of Atawulf, in the cause of Rome, went on and conquered, and the other barbarian settlers in the land were cut short before the joint advance of Goth and Roman.

It must be borne in mind throughout the story that all that Wallia did was done in the name of Rome; all the conquests that he won were held to be restored to the dominion of her Emperor. The dominion, whether of Honorius or of Wallia, seems to have been fully established in western and central Spain, when, it is hard to say from what motive, the loyal conqueror was taken away from his career of victory in the peninsula to enjoy the reward of his labours in a magnificent grant on the other side of the Alps. The West-Goths, before long to be so famous a power in Spain, turned away from the land of which they had been allowed a glimpse and no more *. Their kings were presently to reign on the Garonne; it was not for several generations that they were to reign on the Tagus. Spain was left to be torn in pieces by the warfare of the barbarians with one another, and by the struggles of the Roman officers against the Vandals, who became great again as soon as Wallia's back was turned. The next year (419), when Wallia was no more, we read of a fierce strife between

* Idatius (418) seems pointedly to mark how the work of Wallia in Spain was cut short;

"Gothi, *intermisso certamine quod agebant*, per Constantium ad Gallias revocati, sedes in Aquitanica a Tolosa usque ad Oceanum acceperunt."

Vandals and Suevians—Alans have passed away—in their Gallician corner. The Suevians, destined to keep their place in that region for many generations, had the upper hand; and the remnant, under the guidance of the Roman Count Asterius, joined their brethren in Bætica (420), leaving the Suevians successors to the great Alan dominion in central Spain, which they were to hold till successors of Wallia came back again *. This Vandal migration from Gallicia strengthened the feeble remnant of the nation which had been left in the south, and the Vandals again became a powerful people in Spain (422) under the dynasty which had ruled in their short-lived Gallician territory. The Vandals of Bætica soon called for a Roman force to be sent against them under Castinus, the *magister militum*, and that Roman force did not go without Gothic help. And if our tale is told truly, here was a case of that Gothic faithlessness of which it startles us to hear in the declamation of Salvian. The besieged Vandals —we are not told the place of the siege—pressed by hunger, were on the point of surrender, when the Roman commander unwisely risked a pitched battle, and forsaken by his allies—so the Roman or Spanish annalist tells us—made his way back as a beaten man to Tarragona †.

* Idatius, 420; "Wandali, Suevorum obsidione dimissa, instante Asterio Hispaniarum comite, et sub vicario Maurocello, aliquantis Bracera in exitu suo occisis, relicta Gallæcia ad Bæticam transierunt."

† Ib. 422; "Castinus magister militum cum magna manu et auxiliis Gothorum bellum in Bætica Wandalis infert. quos jam ad inopiam vi obsidionis arctaret, adeo ut se tradere jam pararent,

Three years later the Vandals of Bætica had again grown to such power that Guntheric could make himself master of two of the great cities of Spain, New Carthage on the eastern sea, and Hispalis, Seville, on her great river flowing westward to the Ocean *. Either these great cities had held out all along, or they had been won back for Rome by Wallia. Seville now passed away from the Roman power for ever; New Carthage was again to become a possession of the Republic when the conquests of Justinian again stretched its dominion to the Ocean.

But the later Vandal history is no part of our story, which, at this its last stage, gathers mainly round the West-Goths. The Gothic allies who failed Castinus must have been fetched from the land which was by this time occupied by the Gothic feudatories—it is hard to keep ourselves from the use of that and of kindred words—of the Empire in Gaul. There now was the great seat of Gothic power, the first land within the western border of Rome held by any Gothic people as an established territorial possession. The West-Goths and their king received the second Aquitaine to dwell in and to till †. It was not a land that was new to them.

inconsulte publico certamine confligens, auxiliorum fraude deceptus ad Terraconam victus effugit."

* Idatius, 424; "Wandali Baliaricas insulas prædantur, deinde, Carthagine Spartaria et Hispali eversa et Hispaniis deprædatis, Mauritaniam invadunt."

† Prosper (419) describes the grant with some accuracy; "Constantius patricius pacem firmat cum Wallia, data ei ad habitandam secunda Aquitania et quibusdam civitatibus confinibus provin-

They had appeared, as friends and as enemies, before more than one of its cities in the days when Atawulf marched through Gaul as the soldier of Attalus. The settlement which, we may be sure, had been then designed by Atawulf, but which had been hindered by the successes of Constantius, became a real and memorable fact under Wallia. The land now (418) became the possession of the West-Goths and their king. It was given them to dwell in, to dwell in nominally as subjects and soldiers of the Empire, in truth to make the land that was thus granted to them the kernel of a great, and for those days abiding Gothic power. The second Aquitaine, the land that lies between the mouths of the two mighty Ocean rivers of Gaul, and which is watered by them and their great tributaries, was a noble prize indeed. Its renowned cities call up the memories of many a stirring day in the later history of our own people, and they had already begun to win their place in the annals of the world and of the Church. Poitiers, on her peninsula, with the monuments of unrecorded days looking down from the other side, steep and woody, of her encircling stream—not yet the city of courts and

ciarum." Philostorgius (xii. 4) witnesses that his fellow-sectaries were to till the ground; *μοῖράν τινα τῆς τῶν Γαλάτων χώρας ἐς γεωργίαν ἀποκληρωσάμενοι.*

The tilling of the ground by the Goths is referred to also by Merobaudes, Frag. viii. 13;

> "Cæsareoque diu manus obluctata labori
> Sustinet acceptas nostro sub consule leges,
> Et quamvis Geticis sulcum confundat aratris
> Barbara vicinæ refugit consortia gentis."

minstrels, not yet the city of the holy Radegund, but already the city of the most famous of the Hilaries. The Arian Goth when he entered her gates, entered as master into the home of the champion of orthodoxy, yet not minded, we may believe, to disturb his successors in the baptistery, well nigh without fellow beyond the mountains, which has outlived the church of Hilary's own worship, nor yet in his basilica which had already doubtless in some earlier shape crowned the hill from which the beacon-fire was to flash up to heaven, when, within a hundred years from Wallia's entry, the Frankish convert to the faith of Hilary * marched to break down the Arian dominion in the Aquitanian land. The Goth entered too a second time within the gates of Burdigala, where Atawulf had entered as an ally, and whence his host had marched as destroyers. He now held the city by the estuary of Ocean †, its amphitheatre doubtless still standing whole, perhaps for Wallia, like Theodoric, to wonder at the sports that pleased his Roman subjects. Besides these more famous cities, the second Aquitaine took in also Saintes and Angoulême and Agen; it took in the Petracorian city ‡ by the Dordogne, not yet the borough of Saint Fronto on

* Greg. Tur. ii. 37. See Sketches of French Travel, "The House of Hilary," and "Churches of Poitiers."

† "Burdigalam veni cujus speciosa Garumna
Mœnibus Oceani refluas maris invehit undas,
Navigeram per portam quæ portum spatiosum
Hæc etiam maris spatiosa includit in urbe."
Paulini Euch. 44. His grandfather before him had been there.

‡ See Hist. Essays, vol. iv. p. 131, for notices of Périgueux, &c.

his hill, but still the Vesonna of the Roman, looking up across the stream to the older home of the Gaul; so much at least of Vesonna as, in the years of havoc that had just gone by, had been fenced in with the mighty stones of earlier buildings, to guard at least an inner remnant from the flood of barbarian ravage. The Goth entered on the walls, the gates, the amphitheatre, the temple outside the narrowed enclosure, its mighty round tower still perhaps clothed with its marbles and surrounded by its columns, or perhaps standing as a fresh-made ruin, raw and gaping, to tell of the passage of beleaguering Vandals, Alans, or Suevians. He held the land of hills and streams and dwellings deftly hollowed in the hillsides, dwellings of races whose record had passed away before the coming of the Goth or the coming of the Gaul. But the fief of Wallia and his people was not shut in within the bounds of the second Aquitaine; it stretched into the first. The head of Aquitaine, Avaricum, Bituriges, Bourges, one day to be the seat of Aquitanian kings and Aquitanian patriarchs, formed no part of the first Gaulish heritage of the Goth. The Arvernian land and city, the land and city where the fellowship of Sidonius and Gregory has made us more at home than on any other spot of Gaulish soil, was one of the latest of Gothic conquests, and never knew Wallia as its master. But within the bounds of the first Aquitaine he ruled over the Rutenian city, one day to be Rhodez with its famous tower, over the land and city of the Cadurci, Cahors of evil name, with her peninsula and her bridge, where

Roman walls still guard the memory of men who fought well to save Gaul from the Roman power—he ruled over the Lemorican and the Albigensian cities, each already seated by its river, each doubtless already with its great church in its freshness displacing some holy place of pagan days, but whose chief renown was to come in later times. But if the new land of the Goth did not take in the whole of the first Aquitaine, it overleaped the bounds of Aquitaine in the widest sense. It stretched into the older Roman land of Narbo. The city which had seen the wedding of Atawulf and Placidia was not at once to pass into the hands of Atawulf's successor; but the Goth now won the city from which his kings were presently to reign on both sides of the Pyrenees. Tolosa, whence Cæpio carried off, as men deemed, the gold of Brennus, Tolosa, seated on no hill-top, but planted by the fierce stream of the broad Garonne, and looking back to the hills which the skill of later times has taught to guard her, Tolosa, whose capitol has proclaimed her to all ages as the true child of Rome, Tolosa, where the first basilica of the holy Saturninus must have already arisen beyond her walls, that renowned city now passed into the hands of the Goth to become his kingly seat. There, as at Narbo Martius, we shall seek in vain for traces of his presence. The traveller is told that the castle or palace of the West-Gothic kings stood where the paltry palace of justice of modern times now stands. That is all the help that he gains to call up the picture of Toulouse as the head of a Gothic kingdom. For

the abiding monuments of Gothic rule, though of Gothic rule later than the days of Wallia, he must go to a place which does not seem as yet to have been reckoned as a city, which was not as yet a possession of the Goth, to the wondrous hill crowned by the twofold walls and towers of Carcassonne.

Before the great barbarian invasion Aquitaine and the land of Novempopulania to the south of it were held to be the fairest regions of Gaul. The sternest prophet of the age, in order to rebuke the ungrateful wickedness of its people, has drawn a living picture of the richness of the land itself. It is to be noticed that he does not dwell specially on the greatness and splendour of its cities. And indeed, with the single exception of Bourdeaux—for Toulouse lies beyond the bounds of Aquitaine—none of the Aquitanian cities of which we have just spoken, with all the surpassing charm of their sites, their history, and their monuments, can claim a place in the first rank of the cities of Gaul. In the whole of Wallia's possessions, no city, save the two Bourdeaux and Toulouse, could at all stand by the side of Narbonne or of the great cities east of Rhone. What Salvianus specially enlarges on is the richness of the land itself. It is the marrow of all the Gauls, the breast of all fruitfulness, and more than fruitfulness, of pleasantness and beauty and all delight. The meadows, the vineyards, the orchards, the cornfields, the groves, the fountains that watered them, the streams that flowed among them, made the masters of that land seem as if it was not a share of the common earth which had become their portion, but that they had

become possessors of the image of paradise *. But the men thus highly favoured, the Christian Romans of Aquitaine, had shown themselves indeed unworthy of the gifts of Heaven. They were given up to every kind of vice, to unchastity above all. The Roman of Aquitaine seems to have been the foulest of sinners, save only the Roman of Africa. Such a people needed the chastisement of barbarian invasion to slay some and to reform the rest †. We should be glad to know exactly in what case the land stood at the moment of Wallia's entry. From the general picture of the passage of the barbarians which we looked at long ago, we may fancy that the cities had greatly suffered; Vesonna, with the narrowed enclosure of its walls, is a living witness of the shifts to which men were driven to defend themselves. But even the cities, as in the case of Trier, seem to have sprung up again with wonderful ease to some measure of prosperity, and the fertile land, its cornfields, vineyards, and orchards, might be again smiling now that ten years had passed since the flood of mere havoc had passed over them. And now

* Salvianus, vii. 2; "Nemini dubium est Aquitanos et Novempopulanos medullam fere omnium Galliarum et uber totius fecunditatis habuisse, nec solum fecunditatis, sed quæ præponi interdum fecunditati solent, jucunditatis, pulcritudinis, voluptatis. Adeo illic omnis admodum regio aut intertexta vineis aut florulenta pratis aut distincta culturis aut consita pomis aut amœnata lucis aut inrigua fontibus aut interfusa fluminibus aut crinita messibus fuit, ut vere possessores ac domini terræ illius non tam soli istius portionem quam paradisi imaginem possidere videantur."

† Ib. 12; "Sed paulatim id ipsum tamen, ut dum pars clade cæditur, pars exemplo emendaretur."

milder visitors had come; the chaste Goths were there to dwell in the land and rule it and cleanse it from its defilements, the Goths, such true models of virtue, that notwithstanding their heresy, heresy which the presbyter of Massalia hardly deems to have been their fault, they might dare to look with some hope for a place in the kingdom of heaven *.

The barbarian heretic, in whose dominions none was unclean save the Catholic Roman †, thus sat down to dwell in the land of the Roman, in his stately cities, amid his goodly fields and vineyards, by the side of his cooling founts and streams. He came in not as a conqueror of the Roman, but as in some sort his fellow-subject, at least the faithful soldier of his Emperor, rewarded for his faithful service with lands within his Empire. But it is hard to see how the Goth could be settled on the lands of the Roman except at the cost of the Roman. If not a conqueror in form, he must have been strongly tempted to become a conqueror in practice. The almost received law of such settlements was that the faithful soldiers of the Empire received as their wages two-thirds of the lands of its peaceful citizens. It is not clear whether this system was regularly

* Salvianus, v. 2; "Errant ergo, sed bono animo errant, non odio sed affectu Dei, honorare se Dominum atque amare credentes. Quamvis non rectam habeant fidem, illi tamen hoc perfectam Dei æstimant caritatem. Qualiter pro hoc ipso falsæ opinionis errore in die judicii puniendi sint, nullus potest scire nisi judex."

† Ib. vii. 6; "Esse inter Gothos non licet scortatorem Gothum; soli inter eos præjudicio nationis et nominis permittuntur impuri esse Romani." 23; "Apud Gothos impudici non sunt nisi Romani, jam apud Wandalos nec Romani."

carried out in the Gothic settlement of Aquitaine *, and it is remarkable that in one case where we happen to know something of the details, we see a much greater regard to earlier rights of property than we should have looked for. Chastity was not the only virtue of the Goth. Even in grasping the lands of others, he could sometimes be touched with the natural feeling of just dealing between man and man, even when man and man took the shape of barbarian and Roman, of conqueror and conquered. Paulinus of Bourdeaux and Pella, Paulinus grandson of Ausonius, driven from his own city to dwell in exile and poverty at Marseilles, had his fortunes in some measure raised again by the justice or bounty of one of the new settlers. A Goth who had coveted the last remnant of Paulinus' great estates sent its owner a payment, not, the owner thought, equal to the full value of the land, but a payment which made to the banished man the difference between poverty and comfort, a payment which, if the Goth had had the mind to refuse, the Roman had assuredly no means of enforcing †. And from the picture which

* See Dahn, K. G. v. 70.

† Paulini Eucharisticon, 570;

"Ut cum jam penitus fructus de rebus avitis
Sperare ulterius nullos me posse probasses,
Cunctaque ipsa etiam quæ jam tenuatus habere
Massiliæ potui, amissa jam proprietate,
Conscripta adstrictus sub conditione tenerem,
Emptorem mihi ignotum de gente Gothorum
Excires, nostri quondam qui juris agellum
Mercari cupiens pretium transmitteret ultro,
Haud equidem justum, verumtamen accipienti

Paulinus gives of the relations between Roman and Goth during the earlier occupation of Bourdeaux we may infer that his case did not stand alone. We have seen that the Gothic guest, the delicate euphemism for the stranger who was quartered on the lands of the Roman, showed himself not uncommonly the friend and protector of the host. So in the more lasting settlement, if the Roman of Aquitaine had to surrender two-thirds of his land to the Goth—and, even without such formal division, the transfer of land cannot fail to have been large—we may believe that the Roman often enjoyed what was left to him with greater security under barbarian fellowship than if he had possessed the whole when subject to those exactions of Imperial rule under which Salvian paints every Roman land as groaning.

A third Teutonic kingdom had thus arisen in Gaul. The West-Gothic kingdom was now far greater than those of the Franks or the Burgundians; it was the first of Gaulish powers; it was presently, by extension beyond the Pyrenees, to become for a while the first of all powers beyond the Alps. Of the other two Teutonic nations which had settled on Gaulish soil, one hardly knows how to speak of the Franks. The Salians, under their long-haired kings, are dwelling on lands of the Empire; they are in form subjects and soldiers of the Empire, and in the last character we have more than once seen them do good service. But though they have come geographically

Votivum, fateor, posset quo scilicet una
Et veteres lapsi census fulcire ruinas
Et vitare nova cari mihi damna pudoris."

within the Roman boundary, they have not in any but a purely military sense come within the Roman pale. They have not come into the Roman world in the same way in which Goths and even Burgundians have come into it. The Franks still stand outside almost like the Saxons themselves. Sixty years later, they have not yet adopted the religion of the Empire; they are not even Arian Christians. The Frank, soldier of Rome, perhaps all the more because he is the soldier of Rome, has not yet convinced himself, as the Burgundian has already done, that the God of the Romans is stronger than the gods of his fathers*. When that conviction was at last brought home to his mind, the consequences were memorable indeed. For the military defence of the Empire he is better to be trusted than any other of its nominal vassals; but he has rent away a certain portion of the earth from fellowship with the Roman and Christian world in a way that even the revolted Briton, whether in his island or on the mainland, has not done. The Burgundian was a later settler on Imperial soil than the Frank; but he became a member of the Roman and Christian world far more speedily. Still he was a new-comer, and was only gradually making his way from his first Rhenish home, from the land of Mainz and Worms, to those cities of the Rhoneland which became the dwelling-place and the burying-place of his kings, but which we have had to look at mainly as the

* Sôkratês, vii. 30; *Κατὰ νοῦν λαμβάνοντες ὅτι Ῥωμαίων ὁ Θεὸς ἰσχυρῶς τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτὸν βοηθεῖ, κοινῇ γνώμῃ πάντες ἐπὶ τὸ πιστεῦσαι τῷ Χριστῷ ἐληλύθασιν.* This is in fact Coifi's argument.

prize for which so many rival claimants of the Roman people strove in arms. At this moment the Goth, lord of Toulouse, lord of the second Aquitaine and of much beyond the second Aquitaine, is the foremost figure in Gaul. And at this moment he is, before all his fellows, the immediate vassal and soldier of the Empire. It is perhaps hard for any who come to these studies fresh from the popular notions of Goths, Huns, and Vandals—one has seen the uncouth Asiatic name thrust in as a fellow between two great branches of our own stock—as simple destroyers of Rome and her civilization, to take in the fact of the abiding life of Rome in these times, how all Gaul was still under the nominal obedience of the Empire, and how a large part of it was still under its immediate rule. And those who get their notions of Gaul from a time later in the century, from the time when we come to our first glimpses of continuous Frankish history, may be at least a little startled by the political arrangements of the days of Wallia, which are so strikingly unlike the arrangements of the days of Euric. Long before either people passes under the power of the Frank, the West-Goth is the enemy of Rome, making conquests at the expense of Rome, while of all the Western powers the Burgundian kingdom is that which stands in the closest relations to the Empire. In those days again the continental Briton had become the friend of Rome; in the nomenclature of our forefathers the *Bret-wealas* had joined with the *Rum-wealas* against the Goth and the Saxon. As yet the Goth is the faithful soldier of Rome, holding his noble fief as a free gift of Rome,

holding it by the tenure of winning back the lost subjects of Rome, the *Bret-wealas* of Armorica among them. Such was the work of Wallia, during the short time he wore the Gothic *cynehelm*; Gunthachar, still standing aloof, having made his way into the Empire as the ally of the tyrant Jovinus, formally acknowledged as he was by the lords of the world at Ravenna and Constantinople, held from them no such commission as this. Throughout Gaul, in the theory of this time, the supremacy of Rome was universal; her immediate dominion was the rule; the dominion of her vassal kings was the exception. And it should be noted that these exceptional territories, though very large, were isolated. The three Teutonic powers, Gothic, Burgundian, and Frankish, were carefully kept from marching on one another by the retention of all central Gaul in Imperial hands. To restore central and north-western Gaul to the Roman power was in truth the mission of Wallia, the tenure by which he held another part of Gaul as the allotted dwelling-place of his people. That allotted dwelling-place had no foreign frontier; the Goth had no neighbours except his august overlord and his overlord's doubtful subjects in Armorica. Against these, as we have seen, he had a work to do, and he did it. It could have been only the sword of Wallia which won back for the Empire that restored dominion in Armorica both in the wider and the narrower sense which was so pleasing in the eyes of Rutilius*. To the south

* See above, p. 169. Besides Rutilius we have another witness to the recovery of Armorica in Merobaudes, viii. l. 8;

the Gothic dominion was carefully kept away from any Spanish frontier. From the heights above his capital by the Garonne the Gothic king could look forth on the mountains—the Pyrenæan Alps of the geography of his day—which parted Gaul from the Spanish land where he had been heaved on the shield, and where he had smitten the Vandal and the Alan. But his dominion nowhere reached to the foot of the mountain barrier. From the Frank and the Burgundian he was parted by a far wider stretch of Roman land, and much of it which he had himself made Roman land once more. But the firm friendship of Goth and Roman lasted no longer than the days of Wallia, and the days of Wallia were short. The historian of his own people strangely dates events in the twelfth year of his reign *; an annalist who

> "Lustrat Aremoricas jam mitior incola saltus;
> Perdidit et mores tellus, adsuetaque sævo
> Crimine quæsitas silvas celare rapinas
> Discit inexpertis Cererem committere campis."

* Nothing can be more confused than Jordanis' account of Wallia, Getica, 32, 33. He seems to conceive him as reigning in Gaul from the beginning. The peace of 418 is contracted by Constantius marching from Spain, and Wallia marching to the Pyrenees from the north ("Constantius ovans cum copia armatorum et pene jam regio apparatu Spanias petit; cui Vallias rex Gothorum non cum minori procinctu ad claustra Pyrenæi occurrit; ubi ab utraque parte legatione directa ita convenit pacisci," &c.). In his twelfth year, he invades Spain, and the Vandals flee before him into Africa ("Duodecimo anno regni Valiæ . . . videns Valia Vandalos in suis finibus, id est Spaniæ solo, audaci temeritate ab interioribus partibus Galliciæ ubi eos fugaverat dudum Atauulfus, egressos cuncta in prædas vastare, eo fere tempore quo Hierius et Ardabares consules processissent [A. D. 427], nec mora mox contra eos movit exercitum." Then follows the crossing of

is better to be trusted makes him die in the very year of the settlement. His life, at least his kingly life, was short; and he left no son of his own blood to wear the *cynehelm* of Alaric after him. The rule of the "Gothic lot" in Gaul passed to the first bearer of the great name of Theodoric, a countryman but not a kinsman. But Wallia left a daughter, who was fated to be the mother of a barbarian chief who filled no small space in the world in his own day. It is as the grandfather of Ricimer, half Goth, half Suevian, that Sidonius sings of the deeds of Wallia. But it is only of his Spanish deeds that the man of Lyons and Auvergne could bring himself to sing. Of his acts in Gaul he says nothing, but he tells how he smote the Vandal in the Tartessian land, how he crushed the allied might of the Alan, and heaped western Calpe with their dead bodies *.

Gaiseric into Africa. Wallia wishes to follow, but is hindered by the storm of which we have already heard. Then (c. 33) "nobilitatus intra Spanias incruentamque victoriam potitus Tolosam revertitur, Romano imperio fugatis hostibus aliquantas provincias, quod promiserat, derelinquens, sibique adversa post longum valitudine superveniente rebus humanis excessit."

Yet it is plain that Wallia died very soon after the settlement in Aquitaine. Idatius places his death in 418; Prosper, who places the settlement in 419, must have put his death in 420; though he does not record it. See Clinton; Dahn, K. G. v. 71. Olympiodôros (465) does not give the date, *Οὐαλίου τοῦ φυλάρχου τελευτήσαντος, Θευδέριχος πρὸς ἀρχὴν διαδέχεται.*

* Carm. ii. 363;

"Quod Tartessiacis avus hujus Wallia terris
Wandalicas turmas et junctos Martis Alanos
Stravit, et occiduam texere cadavera Calpem."

This last line *may* refer to the shipwreck which shattered Wallia's

Yet, if the reign of Wallia was short, his work was great, and in a sense abiding. His Aquitanian kingdom perished within a century, and all that the Goth kept on Gaulish soil was a strip of Mediterranean coast which formed no part of his first grant. But Wallia was none the less the first to found, on a large part of the soil of Gaul, an orderly Teutonic kingdom, a kingdom which, though it was soon to have its wars with Rome, was still essentially a kingdom of the school of Atawulf. Thus we cannot say that the kingdom of the Burgundians was as yet; we cannot say that the kingdom of the Franks ever became such. Herein we have reached one of the main causes of the abiding difference between northern and southern Gaul. The establishment between the Loire and the Garonne of a Teutonic people who came in so distinctly as the allies and champions of Rome has had a deep effect on later history. The West-Gothic dominion in Gaul, like the more splendid but less abiding East-Gothic dominion in Italy, was the rule of Gothic kings reigning over a Roman people according to Roman law. The Goth came; he passed away; but he left the land thoroughly Roman. He left it more Roman than he found it. His conquest had the usual effect of such conquests. The conqueror becomes the pupil and missionary of those whom he immediately subdues, and helps to root out any traces that may be left of any state of things that is earlier than either. So in an earlier day the political

fleet; but surely the corpses are more naturally those of Vandals slain in Wallia's campaign in Bætica.

supremacy of Rome in the eastern lands only confirmed the intellectual supremacy of Greece; wherever the Roman went, he carried Greek culture with him; he became as familiar with the tongue of Greece as with his own, but he never learned the tongue of the Syrian or the Egyptian. So the Teutonic conquerors of the western lands of Rome became pupils and missionaries of Rome, helping to root out any traces that were left of things older than Roman rule. The Goth, the Burgundian, the Frank, even, we may be sure, the Vandal, all learned to speak the tongue of Rome; none of them learned to speak the tongue of the Celt, the Iberian, the Phœnician, or the Moor. Thus while the new Celtic state, the Britain of the mainland, was growing up in the north-western peninsula of Gaul, a powerful influence was brought to strengthen the work which had been so long going on of wiping out whatever Celtic traces were still left in other parts of the land. We are startled to find, in a casual, a sportive and something dark, passage of Sidonius, words which might seem to imply that in his day traces of Celtic speech still lingered among the Roman nobles of Auvergne*. I am not sure that his words necessarily imply all

* Sidonius writes to Ecdicius (Ep. iii. 3); "Mitto isthic ob gratiam pueritiæ tuæ undique gentium confluxisse studia literarum, tuæque personæ quondam debitum, quod sermonis Celtici squamam depositura nobilitas, nunc oratorio stylo, nunc etiam Camenalibus modis imbuebatur. Illud in te affectum principaliter universitatis accendit, quod quos olim Latinos fieri exegeras deinceps esse barbaros vetuisti." But I am not sure that these words, at once playful and high-polite, need be taken quite literally.

the inferences which have been drawn from them; but of one thing we may be certain, that the Gothic conquest at which Sidonius so deeply grieved went far to root out any traces of the elder speech which still lived on. What had escaped the sword of Cæsar did Euric slay. In this point there is no difference between the Goth and the Frank; but in another point the two Teutonic conquerors stand quite apart. The coming of the Goth did not bring with it anything like that Teutonic infusion in blood, speech, institutions, which the Frankish settlement brought into northern Gaul, and which has ever distinguished France from Aquitaine and Burgundy. The saying, far truer and truer in far more senses than he who spoke it dreamed of, that "there are no Frenchmen south of Loire," has been largely made to be true by the presence in those lands of Wallia and his West-Goths. If he, first of his race, made a part of Western Europe to be in some sense Gothia, he ruled that whatever he made into Gothia should be Romania still. He made things ready for the great day when Goth and Roman as equal powers, equal European and Christian powers, leading in their train the European but not yet Christian contingent of the loyal Frank, should march forth side by side to the battle with the Hun.

One point must never be allowed to pass out of mind, that, for two generations longer (419–486), the Roman power in Gaul was still a real and living thing, keeping on its being alongside of the powers of the Goth, the Burgundian, and the Frank. Wherever the rule of Rome had not been disturbed—for the

rule of Constantine was as much the rule of Rome as the rule of Honorius—wherever it had been restored by the victories of Rome's Gothic ally, there the dominion of the Empire went on untouched. So it did no less in Spain, within so much of the land as the Suevian and Vandal had either never occupied or had been forced to give back to the might of Wallia. Within a large, though irregularly shaped, part of Gaul, Cæsar Augustus reigned over his Roman people, and it was sometimes decided on Gaulish soil who Cæsar Augustus should be. More than thirty years after these times, a man of the land of Sidonius and of Gregory, the father-in-law of our præfect, poet, and prelate, the Arvernian Avitus, was proclaimed Augustus, not at Rome or at Ravenna, but on the capitol of Toulouse and in the palace of Arles. And he came back after his Italian reign to lay his bones in the holiest place of the Arvernian land (455), before the tomb of Saint Julian of Brioude *. Even then, after the Huns had been driven back from Gaul, Arles, the city of the Constantines, was still neither Gothic nor Burgundian, but Roman as of old. It remained so, along with the land to which the name of the *Province* still specially clave, and from which

* Idatius, 455; "In Galliis Avitus Gallus civis ab exercitu Gallicano et ab honoratis, primum Tolosæ, dehinc apud Arelatum Augustus appellatus, Romam pergit et suscipitur." Sidonius, in his Panegyric, has of course much more to say of him, as not merely "Gallus civis" but specially Arvernian. His death in his native land comes from Gregory of Tours, ii. 11; "Basilicam sancti Juliani martyris cum multis mun ribus expetivit. Sed impleto in itinere vitæ cursu, obiit delatusque ad Brivatinsem vicum, ad pedes antedicti martyris est sepultus."

it has never been wiped out, for five and twenty years longer (480). The land still loyal to Rome when Rome had in a manner ceased to be Roman, the land which sent an unavailing wail to its sovereign at Constantinople against the rule of Odowaker *, passed in the course of the next four years under the dominion of Euric the West-Goth †.

The Goth had indeed often striven to make his way into Arles in the course of the sixty years between the settlement of Wallia in Aquitaine and the conquests of Euric in Provence. And no wonder. For those were the days of the highest greatness of the city of Constantine by the Rhone. Thirty-five years before the elevation of Avitus (420), two years at most after the death of Wallia, the little Rome of Gaul had been raised by the law of Honorius and Theodosius to its highest place, as the head, the metropolis, of seven provinces of Gaul. It is from the sounding language of this decree that we get our most glowing picture of the prosperity of Arles at this moment. The proud city which received the choicest gifts of all the world was to be the place of

* This comes out in the fragment of Candidus, 476; Ὀδόακρος Ἰταλίας καὶ αὐτῆς ἐκράτησε Ῥώμης, καὶ στασιασάντων αὐτῷ τῶν δυσμικῶν Γαλατῶν διαπρεσβευσαμένων τε αὐτῶν καὶ Ὀδοάκρου πρὸς Ζήνωνα, Ὀδοάκρῳ μᾶλλον ὁ Ζήνων ἐπέκλινεν. These western Gauls cannot mean those of Armorica as opposed to those of the Province, but rather, in the mouth of the Byzantine writer, the Gauls of Gaul as distinguished from those of Asia. So I have known an American writer distinguish Helias of La Flèche as "Count of *Eastern* Maine," that is of the Gaulish county as opposed to the New England state.

† See Jordanis, Getica, 47; Isidor. Chron. Goth. 418.

yearly meeting for the chief men of seven provinces, those of Vienne, two of Narbonne, Novempopulania, Maritime Alps, and, what we might hardly have looked for, both the Aquitaines, though the second of them and part of the other had been given for the Goths to dwell in and to till *. So little was the supreme rule of the Emperor held to be taken away by the presence in the Aquitanian land of his faithful subjects and soldiers. The privilege may seem a vain one; yet it was cherished and remembered, and ages afterwards copies of this law of Honorius and Theodosius were still made and kept in the archives of the great South-Gaulish cities. And in this grouping of provinces round Arles we see in a marked way the signs of that division between southern and northern Gaul of which we have already spoken. It was only of the lands south of Loire that Arles was to be the immediate head, the place of yearly meeting, though doubtless Arles now supplanted Trier, no longer a fit centre for Roman rule, as the dwelling-place of the Roman præfect of the Gauls. Yet lands which formed no part of the seven provinces, which sent no deputies to the gathering at Arles, still clave to Rome and to all that the name of Rome implied. Or if we cannot say that they clave to Rome when they were cut off from all communication with Rome, Old or New, when the Old Rome obeyed a barbarian king and the New obeyed an Emperor who disowned them, they at least clave to their Roman life and Roman speech and gloried

* Cod. Theod. There is a special mention of "Novempopulania et secunda Aquitania, quæ provinciæ longius constitutæ sunt."

in the name of Romans, while Goths, Franks, and Britons were the barbarian neighbours who hemmed them in. In Armorica in the widest sense, in the land between Seine and Loire, the Roman life abode untouched for more than sixty years after the Roman power had been restored in those lands by Wallia. To the West, the peninsular Armorica became independent as the new British land. To the North, the Frank, if not as yet actually a conqueror of fresh Roman lands, was growing and strengthening himself to become such before long. To the South, the conquests of the Goth, the advance of the power of Euric, combined with the southward march of the Burgundians along the Rhoneland, altogether cut off this central Roman land from the Roman lands of Italy and Provence. The day of sorrow came when Sidonius saw his dear Auvergne pass under Gothic rule, and when he himself was carried away from his flock and city, at the bidding of a Gothic master. But lands further to the North still were Roman. After Odowaker began to rule in Italy, independent Roman powers still lived on alike in Gaul and in Dalmatia. When Ælla and Cissa drew up their keels on the shore which they were to make a Saxon shore in a new sense, there was still a Roman coast, a coast which they may well have been wont to ravage, on the southern shore of the Channel. But between the Gaulish and the Dalmatian remnant there was one marked difference. In Dalmatia an Emperor who had reigned in Italy still went on reigning after he had ceased to reign in Italy, and it was to the master of Italy, to Odowaker himself, that the power of

Julius Nepos gave way. In the still Roman land of Gaul, at Soissons and Orleans, at Paris and Rouen, there is no distinct evidence to show whether any Emperor was acknowledged at all. In this isolated Roman dominion the Roman power was maintained by two rulers, father and son, of whom it seems at least clear that neither ever assumed the purple. Ægidius, faithful subject of Majorian, enemy of Wallia's Suevian grandson, kept on in Gaul the Roman independence which he strove in vain to keep on in Italy. After him came his son, Syagrius, the last Roman ruler in Gaul. Some give him only the obvious title of Duke; but in one version, in that which has become most famous, in the record of Gregory of Auvergne and Tours, he stands forth with a style which we do not look for till we have reached quite another land and quite another time. The last of Roman princes in the land that Gaius Julius won for Rome appears as bearing at Soissons the title which some deemed that Gaius Julius would gladly have borne in Rome. Since the last "Rex Romanus" fled to Ardea and Cumæ, the dreaded monosyllable had never been coupled with the name of Rome. Her "rex sacrorum," the "regium" of her pontiffs, lived on as survivals of Numa and of Ancus. As the Empire grew, as extraordinary commissioners grew into abiding sovereigns, the cognates and derivatives of the hated word were freely applied to the rule, to the house, the whole belongings of the Emperor. All about him was kingly; even his wife was in common speech "regina"; but none save one member of the Flavian house ever bore the hated

style as a formal title. That there was a "Hannibalianus Rex" we know by the sure witness of coins; we do not know what his kingdom was or where it lay; assuredly he was not "Rex Romanus" or "Rex Romanorum." But this last astounding title, which seems to bring before us an East-Frankish Henry six hundred years before his time, was borne, if Gregory is to be believed, by Syagrius of Soissons. It may be so or it may not. Gregory, used to kings, may simply have carried back to Syagrius the style of the Chilperics and Guntchramns among whom his own life was spent. The name was sometimes used in a strange way, whether by carelessness or design. Sulpicius Severus applies the name, at least in its oblique cases, pretty freely to both tyrants and lawful princes. Other cases in the fifth century might be found in which an Emperor or tyrant is spoken of in the same way. But the "Syagrius Rex Romanorum" of Gregory sounds like a formal title*. Could such a title have been used? It may be that the Romans of Gaul, cut off from the Romans of other lands, brought down to form as it were simply one among the several nations of Gaul, surrounded by nations ruled by kings, may, like the Hebrews of old, have

* "Siagrius Romanorum rex" c. ii. 27, where see the note to Giesebrecht's German translation. He is "Romanorum patricius" in the Hist. Epit. 15, and "Dux" in Hincmar.

I doubt whether Sulpicius ever uses the word in the nominative. It may be refining; but this almost seems like another stage, beyond that in which the derivatives are freely used but not the word itself. "Siacrius Romanorum rex," as a formal description, has a somewhat different sound from the casual use of "regi" or "regem."

wished to be like the nations round about them, and to have a king to go before them. Ægidius, father of Syagrius, is said, in a strange legend, to have been for a while a king, not indeed King of the Romans, but chosen King of the Franks, as Belisarius might have been chosen King of the East-Goths. For his son to be King of the Romans was only one step further. Anyhow, under whatever style, the Roman state in Gaul lived on after the barbarians had begun to rule in Italy. And it may be after all, as I have hinted already, that when the Roman of Gaul yielded to the Frank, he yielded only to Roman authority in another shape. It may be that Syagrius, king or tyrant, was disowned by the Augustus at New Rome, to whom his kingly style would certainly not be pleasing. It may be that Chlodowig, soon to be Consul, some said Augustus, entered Orleans and Paris, as Sarus strove to enter Valence, as a Roman officer sent to chastise a tyrant. One thing at least is certain; at Soissons, as at Salona, the year 476 A.D., the year so dear to the compiler and the crammer, the year so really memorable at Rome and at Ravenna, was a year of no special moment.

We have thus traced the events of thirteen memorable years, years which, more than any other, fixed the later history of Western Europe. The great powers of Western Europe in later times, England, France, Castile, are not yet in being; nor can we say that the lesser powers of Wales, Burgundy, Aquitaine, Aragon, are as yet in being either. But the first steps have been taken which were in the course of time, in some cases in no long

course of time, to call them all into being. No part of Britain is as yet England; but the Roman has left the island, and the Angle and the Saxon are on their voyage, to reach the prize, it may be, somewhat sooner than we are taught by the reckoning of years that we know best. And when the history of the Angle and the Saxon on British soil begins, then begins also the history of Wales, the history of the British people in their old land, but in their new character of *Wealas* to their Teutonic invaders. The French win Gaul; it is but a small part of Gaul, and not that part to which the name was specially to cleave, which is already known as *Francia*; but he who gave it the name is already in the land, and ready to march on. But the presence of the Goth far to the south of him has fixed a barrier which has decreed that, though southern Gaul may one day politically become French, yet it shall never become Frankish by actual settlement or French by the final results of such settlement. In Spain it might seem that not even the beginnings of the modern world are to be seen. We left the peninsula strangely parted out between the Roman, the Vandal, and the Suevian, parted out in a way which certainly does not give the slightest hint of a future Castile, but which does suggest a future Aragon and a future Andalusia, and which might be even thought to suggest more faintly a future Portugal. But they suggest these things only geographically. The Vandal was soon to pass of his own will from Spain, to play a great part in Africa, and to be swept away by the revived power of Rome. The Roman and

the Suevian were in their turn to yield to the West-Goth. He has not as yet a foot of ground in the land where Atawulf died and where Wallia conquered; but he has seen the land, and he is fated to come back to it. He is to come back to it to put on in the course of time the noblest character of all. The Hun was a worse foe than the Saracen; but against the Hun the Goth had to fight but for a single day; against the Saracen he had to wage the ceaseless battle of five hundred years, till the Saracen was shut up in the momentary home of the Vandal, to pass at last back to the land whence he himself came, the land from which the Vandal had been rooted out. That the slow and steady resurrection of Spain was essentially the work of the Goth we cannot doubt. The tameless mountaineers of the north could keep their homes against all comers, Roman, Gothic, and Saracen; it was hardly they who won back the land step by step from the passes of the Pyrenees to the Mount of Tarik. The name of the Goth has passed away alike from Spain and from Gaul; but he did his work well in both lands. The Frank was to have his day of glory too against the same enemy, when the Arab lords of Roman Africa and Gothic Spain were broken in pieces by the hammer of Austrasian Karl. But the abiding life of Spain, the long endurance, the winning back of the land inch by inch, surely came of a spirit which the Goth had breathed into the Roman land. The Spain of 711, much as it might have fallen back from the great days of Gothic rule, was still something widely different from the Spain of 409.

It might be crushed; but it could rise again; it could rise again of its own strength. The whole inheritance of Atawulf on Spanish soil was the space of ground—far less than seven feet—which was needed for the casket of the infant Theodosius. But his words and his works followed him. The man who laid the foundations of modern Europe had trained a people who could endure the calling to be the foremost and most abiding champions in western lands of Europe in her higher garb of Christendom.

[VII.]*

[THEODORIC THE WEST-GOTH AND AETIUS.]

In a former course of lectures I dealt at some length with the revolutions of Gaul, Spain, and Britain during about twelve eventful years in the early part of the fifth century. Those were the years which saw the great Teutonic settlements in Gaul and Spain, and which, if they did not see any actual Teutonic settlements in Britain, saw the events which opened the way for such settlements and which gave them, when they came, their distinctive character. From Britain the dominion of Rome has passed away; an independent British people is left, greatly modified no doubt by more than four hundred years of Roman intercourse, by not far short of four hundred years of Roman dominion, but still in their essence a British people, not a Roman people in the sense in which the provincials of Gaul and Spain were Roman. In Gaul and Spain the Roman power still lives on; but Rome no longer keeps the full dominion over the whole land. She has sunk to be one power among many. The majesty, the magic, of her name still has its influence over strangers and enemies; independent rulers, even conquering foes, are ready to

[* This lecture was originally the first of a second course.]

acknowledge some shadowy supremacy in the Roman Augustus. But as regards practical dominion, the rule of Rome takes in only a part of the great lands of Gaul and Spain, and that not the larger part. In the other parts of those lands, the Roman life still goes on; the tongue, the law, the creed, of Rome is still respected; the Roman bishop still keeps his church in the Roman city; the Roman magistrate still dispenses the law of Rome to a Roman people; but the political power has passed away from the Roman Emperor to the Gothic, Burgundian, or Suevian king. Still it is most important to bear in mind, not only how much of Roman life stayed on in the lands which passed under Teutonic rule, but how large a part of the land still, deep into the fifth century, remained under direct Roman rule. It was not till eighty years after the great crossing of the Rhine that Gaul saw the end of direct Roman dominion in the fall of the kingdom, duchy, patriciate, whatever we are to call it, of Ægidius and Syagrius. By that time the rule of Rome had passed away from Spain; but it had passed away but yesterday. Only then continuous Roman rule lasted longer in Gaul than in Spain; when it did pass away, it passed away for ever. A day was to come when the titles of Roman sovereignty were again to be heard in Gaul; but they were to be heard because a lord of Gaul and Germany was one day to become the lord of Rome. And when they were again heard in Gaul, they were to be again heard in Spain also. For the lord of Gaul and Germany and Rome was to be also the lord of that corner of Spain where continuous Roman rule

had been most abiding. But before that day came, that more direct Roman rule which the fifth century brought to an end in both Gaul and Spain was to revive for seventy years in another corner of the Spanish land. The only Roman rule that Gaul saw after the fall of Syagrius was the rule of her own Karlings. But Justinian and Heraclius, who never reigned in Narbo and Nemausus, did reign in Gades and New Carthage. In the middle of the sixth century, in the first years of the seventh, Cæsar Augustus, from his throne in the younger Rome, again ruled from the Euphrates to the Ocean.

But Spain, like Italy or Constantinople, is, for our immediate purposes, of only secondary importance. Often as our own island has passed away from our sight, often as those who were presently to make it our own have passed away also, neither the land nor the future folk of the land ought ever to have passed out of our thoughts. Every event that I have dwelled on in continental history, every picture that I have striven to give of continental life, during this great period of the Wandering of the Nations, has been meant as an indirect contribution to the history of Britain and of the Teutonic conquerors of Britain. The light of one land enables us, by the power of contrast, to pierce through the darkness of the other. The recorded events of the one land enable us, by the same power of contrast, to call up the unrecorded events of the other. By seeing what Teutonic conquest was on the mainland, we learn what it was not in Britain, and thereby we learn what it was. But for this purpose the land that best teaches us is

Gaul. Of the lands concerned it is, on the whole, the land of which we know the most. We have far fuller pictures of the men and events of Gaul during this time than we have of the men and the events of Spain; we have pictures at least as full as we have of the men and the events of Italy. Nor is it to be forgotten that what we know of Italy is largely owing to the witness of a man of Gaul. The full light of Gaul is best fitted to pierce the utter darkness of Britain. And on every other ground Gaul is of all continental lands the one which it is most obvious to compare and to contrast with Britain. Geography and history have ever brought Gaul and Britain into close contact. And at no time were they brought into closer contact than in those opening years of the fifth century with which we have already dealt. We have seen how deeply the events of one land affected the other. And in Gaul and Britain too we see to some extent the same actors, actors who play no part in the contemporary story of Spain or Italy. In Gaul, as in Britain, we have to record the doings of the Briton and the Saxon, though in Gaul their doings form only a secondary part of the main tale. Gaul gives us the typical picture of a Roman land passing under one form of Teutonic conquest, while Britain, in its very absence of a picture, does in truth give us the clearest picture of a Roman land passing under Teutonic conquest of another kind. But it is only by the clearly marked shapes of the Gaulish picture that we can read any meaning into the dim and shadowy outlines of the British picture. The history of Gaul then, both for

its own sake and as our indirect guide to the history —shall we say to the lack of history?—of Britain, must be the main subject of our thoughts for some time to come. And for some time to come the main subject in the history of Gaul is the history of the West-Gothic power in Aquitaine.

We left Gaul, about the year 420, divided into the lands which were still under the direct rule of the Empire and the lands which had passed into the possession of its nominal vassals. These last lands, the dominions of the Goth in the south-west, of the Frank in the north-east, of the Burgundian in the central east, are all isolated. The immediate Roman dominion stretches uninterruptedly, with however irregular a frontier, from the borders of Italy to the Ocean and the British Channel. All central Gaul, all the northern coast west of the marshes of the Frank, is Roman; for the sword of Wallia is held to have won back the Briton of the mainland to the obedience of Cæsar. The bidding of Ravenna is obeyed at Soissons, at Paris, and at Rouen. This is a very different state of things from that of a few years earlier, when Vandal, Alan, and Suevian laid waste the whole land at pleasure, save the corner which was held by the British tyrant at Arles. And this great revival of the Roman power was largely due to Roman valour and conduct in the person of Constantius. He had taught the Goth that the Roman could still strike, and that it was better to have Cæsar for a friend than for an enemy. Still the existence of the Roman dominion in Gaul depended on the will of the Goths and of the other barbarian powers.

We may doubt whether any one of them could as yet overthrow it by a single effort. It was before all things unlikely that they should all unite to overthrow it by a common effort. Rome might even hope, if attacked by one barbarian power, to find allies among the others. When the Roman power in Gaul did at last fall, two generations after the time which we have reached, it was because it had been so gradually dismembered by one enemy that it could at least be swallowed with no great effort by another. That Roman society and Roman government in Gaul lived on, for nearly seventy years after the settlement of the Goth, for eighty years after the combined invasion of Vandal, Suevian, and Alan, is a speaking witness indeed to the magic power which Rome exercised over the minds of all who had to deal with her. She had indeed led captive her conquerors.

We begin then our present inquiry with the history of that West-Gothic dominion in Gaul which grew out of the Imperial grant of the second Aquitaine, and something more than the second Aquitaine, to Wallia and his people. To Wallia succeeded Theodoric, the first bearer of that renowned name with whom we have to deal *. Gothic custom allowed

* The likeness of the name Theodoric to a familiar class of Greek names—the likeness which caused a modern writer to think that he was doing the specially Teutonic thing when he spoke of its greatest bearer by the far later form of *Dietrich*—seems to have been caught at from the beginning. When the name was borne by the great East-Goth, it was no longer to be trifled with; as

free choice of kings, and it does not appear that Theodoric was a kinsman of Wallia. His own words however, taken in their natural sense, would imply that he was a grandson of Alaric through a daughter*. In any case he was the founder of a dynasty which kept the West-Gothic crown through several generations. And he was a worthy founder. His reign was long and stirring; his end was the most glorious that could fall to the lot of man. And he had to strive with a worthy rival, to be at last changed into a worthier comrade. The two great elements in the Gaul of the fifth century had alike vigorous representatives in Theodoric the Gothic king and in Aetius the Roman patrician. In the character of the Roman champion there are some dark shades, but on Gaulish soil they are hardly to be seen. His evil deeds, true and imaginary, belong to the tale of Italy and Africa, as his bloody end belongs to that of Italy. On our side of the Alps he is wholly the

applied to the earlier Theodorics it takes various shapes. Sidonius uses several forms in verse (Pan. in Av. 320); the first Theodoric is *Theudoris*; the second, in his prose portrait (Ep. i. 2), has his real name *Theodoricus*. Prosper and Idatius use the real name. In Jordanis (Get. 34, 44) the West-Gothic Theodorics are both *Theodoridus* or *Theodoritus*; the East-Goth is *Theodoricus*. So Isidore calls the first Theodoric *Theodorides*, which he afterwards changes to *Theodericus* and *Teudericus*. In Ep. i. 1 he plays on the likeness between the Greek and the Gothic names; "leges Theodosianas calcans, Theodoricianasque proponens." The *o* in the received form Theodoric is most likely owing to the likeness to *Theodorus*. Procopios' form Θευδέριχος comes nearer to the Gothic.

* In the Panegyric on Avitus, 505, Theodoric is made distinctly to call Alaric "noster avus." I find it hard to believe with Dahn (K. G. v. 71) that this simply means "prædecessor."

valiant soldier, the skilled diplomatist, who kept Arles for Rome against the Goth and who won over the Goth to play his part in a strife that was more than Gothic, more than Roman, the great strife of the Catalaunian fields.

The relations between Aetius and Theodoric are the relations of the leaders of two nations—at least of two powers—whose relations may be at any time either friendly or hostile. A far greater space, in the general estimate of Aetius, has been given to his alleged personal rivalry with the other eminent Roman captain of the time, that Count Boniface whom we have already seen baffling Atawulf himself on Gaulish soil *. The received tale is tempting, because it enables us to draw, as more than one writer has drawn with great skill, one of the most striking of contrasts †. The two men, each worthy to be called the last of the Romans, seem in a manner to exchange parts and characters. As the tale is commonly told, Boniface, so long the foremost champion of Rome against barbarians of every race, comes at last to invite the Vandal into the Roman province that he guarded, while Aetius, half barbarian by early training, relying throughout his career on barbarian help, after leading Boniface into his old error, after slaying him with his own hand, comes to be the guardian of Europe against the Hun, as he had once been the guardian of Gaul against the Goth. Now the received view of the long rivalry between Boniface and Aetius rests, as I am fully

* See above, pp. 197, 198.

† This contrast is well brought out by Hodgkin, i. 871–6.

convinced, on no sure contemporary witness. But the story, and the way in which it has grown up, throws such an instructive light on the history of the fifth century that I have made it the subject of a full examination in another shape*. And after all, true or false, it is not the side of the career of Aetius which concerns us. The defender of Roman Gaul was not a native of Gaul, though it may be that he saw in early life events wrought on Gaulish soil which touched him very closely. Aetius, son of Gaudentius, born on the lower Danube in the Roman Scythia, was, in childhood and youth, a hostage, first with the Goth and then with the Hun. He learned the ways of the barbarians; he gained power and influence among them; he married a wife of royal Gothic blood. His father, we are told, count and *magister equitum*, was slain, at some time not stated, in a military outbreak in Gaul. Whether Aetius was with him we know not, nor do we know whether it was before or after his father's death that he rose to a high place on that side of the Empire in which he was born. Præfect of Constantinople, he well nigh lost his life by an assassin's dagger. His recorded Western career begins among the confusions which followed the death of Honorius. In these he first plays a part in Italy and then in Gaul. I shall speak more fully of those revolutions and of the part which Aetius played in them in my special monograph on him and Boniface. Their main outline concerns us here. On the death of Honorius, the Western Empire passed to John the chief notary,

* See Appendix: Aetius and Boniface.

who of course was in the eyes of the Theodosian family and their partisans looked on as a tyrant. But he seems to have been peaceably chosen at Ravenna, and to have been generally acknowledged in those parts of the West which still remained to the Empire. That he was acknowledged in Gaul is shown by clear incidental evidence. The Prætorian Præfect of Gaul, that Exsuperantius of Poitiers of whose Armorican exploits we have already heard *, was slain at Arles in an outbreak of the soldiers (424), and it is pointedly added that John took no vengeance for this outrage †. It has been inferred from the failure of John to punish this murder that he looked on the deed as done in his own service, that is doubtless that the cause of John was popular with the soldiers, while Exsuperantius asserted the claim of the Theodosian house ‡. It would be equally easy to infer that Exsuperantius was at least not an avowed enemy of John, that men looked to John to punish the offenders, but that he did not deem himself strong enough to bring on himself the enmity of the Gothic army. The point is that it was remarked that John did not punish a deed of blood done at Arles, a remark which could be made only of a man whose authority was fully acknowledged in Roman Gaul. In the East he was of course branded as an

* See above, pp. 168–70.

† This comes from the version of Prosper in the note to Roncalli, i. 653; "Hoc tempore Exuperantius Pictavus, Præfectus Prætorii Galliarum, in civitate Arelatensi militum seditione occisus est; idque apud Joannem inultum fuit."

‡ Fauriel, i. 176.

usurper at the court of Theodosius, and that Emperor took vigorous means to assert the claims of his house by sending an army into Italy to overthrow John and to establish the rule of his aunt Placidia and her young son Valentinian. Against this attack John availed himself of the help of Aetius, who was his partisan and high in his service. He, the man who knew how to handle barbarians, was sent to bring a Hunnish force to the support of his master. He went; he came back with his savage allies. But by that time the forces of the East had won back Italy for the Theodosian house, and John had paid his forfeit in the amphitheatre of Aquileia. Aetius came with his Huns; they even met the forces of Theodosius in arms. Many a man of that day would have used such a power to set up a tyranny of his own. Aetius did otherwise; he submitted to the Augusta and the young Augustus. His wonderful influence won over the barbarians to go back on payment of a sum of money, and he himself went into Gaul as the officer of Valentinian to maintain the cause of Rome, as represented by him and his mother, against all enemies.

He found there work enough to do on behalf of his new sovereigns. The history of Gaul for some years is the history of the labours of Aetius to win back the lost dominions of Rome to the Empire. To read his story, whether in the dry prose of the annalists or in the high-flown verses of Sidonius, brings home to us in all fulness at once by how many enemies the Empire was attacked at the same time and what life there still was in the

Imperial power, what magic in the Imperial name. It needed only a Stilicho or an Aetius, if not, as of old, to win fresh conquests, at least to guard the actual frontier and ever and anon to win back some part of what had been lost. We need not search too minutely into the nationality of the troops by whom the victories of Rome were now won. It was doubtless by barbarian arms that Aetius struck down the barbarians; but they were barbarians who were Roman by allegiance, who had been brought within the range of Roman influences, and whose adoption as the armed guards of the still Roman lands was one of the surest signs of Rome's abiding moral power. But the defender of Rome, at the head of the soldiers of Rome, has to be everywhere. One year in northern, another in southern Gaul, now altogether beyond the bounds of the province, carrying warfare hither and thither wherever an enemy of Rome's western dominion is to be found, now and then finding time to show himself in Italy for the maintenance of his own interests and the overthrow of private adversaries—such was for years the busy life of the man who, somewhat unfairly perhaps to one or two not unworthy successors, men spoke of as the *last of the Romans.*

His first duty was to withstand the advance of the Teutonic power which had been so lately established on the Garonne and which was seeking to extend itself to the Rhone and beyond. The King of the West-Goths was laying siege to the city which had been so lately established as the capital

of a land which took in his own dominions*. It is another witness to the greatness of Arles in these times that we shall find it for a long while to come

* It is not easy to put together a consistent account of the warfare between Aetius and Theodoric. Were there two wars or one before that which began in 436, the consulship of Isidorus and Senator? Prosper records an attack on Arles on the part of the Goths, who are driven back by Aetius, immediately after the fall of John and accession of Valentinian. His next entry after the proclamation of Valentinian as Augustus stands thus;

"Arelas nobile oppidum Galliarum a Gothis multa vi oppugnatum est, donec imminente Aetio non impuniti discederent."

Prosper of Aquitaine is our best authority for Gaulish affairs; he has nothing more to say about wars with the Goths till 436.

The Spanish Idatius is also a very valuable writer; but for Gaulish affairs we should, in case of contradiction, commonly prefer Prosper. We are not startled at his having nothing to say about the siege of Arles at the very beginning of Valentinian's reign; we notice that, in that Emperor's sixth year (430), he has a notice to which there is nothing answering in Prosper. This runs thus;

"Per Aetium comitem haud procul de Arelate quædam Gothorum manus exstinguitur, Anaulfo optimate eorum capto."

If this stood quite by itself, I think we should be inclined to look upon it as the same story as that recorded by Prosper, only moved to a wrong year. But it comes in a connexion which gives it unusual importance. In this year and the next Idatius is recording events in Spain, in which he himself was concerned and Aetius also; he was also clearly narrowly watching the career of Aetius. Under the sixth year of Valentinian he has three entries. He first mentions a Suevian inroad into Gallæcia followed by a peace. Then comes the entry which I have just quoted, followed by the words, "Juthungi per eum similiter debellantur et Nori." The third records the slaughter of Felix at Ravenna, in which we learn from Prosper that Aetius had a hand, a subject on which

the chief object of Gothic ambition. Now in what character did Theodoric march against Arles? We may take for granted that his choice of a time for action

I have said more elsewhere [see Appendix]. Under the seventh year comes an entry of which I do not profess to understand every word, and which only incidentally concerns us, but which is incidentally most important;

"Aetius, dux utriusque militiæ, Noros edomat rebellantes. Rursum Suevi initam cum Gallæcis pacem libata sibi occasione conturbant. Ob quorum deprædationem *Idatius episcopus ad Aetium ducem, qui expeditionem agebat in Gallis, suscipit legationem.* Vetto, qui de Gothis dolose ad Gallæciam venerat, sine aliquo effectu rediit ad Gothos."

One wishes to know more of this mission of Vetto, which clearly points to a disposition on the part of Theodoric to win again a Spanish position for the Goths; but there seems to be nothing more to be found out about it. But the point for us is that Idatius is himself brought into personal relations with Aetius, and that on Gaulish soil. This at once accounts for the care with which he traces the career of Aetius in this year, as in the year before, and also in the year after—when he records the death of Boniface. And it clearly gives a value to his witness as to this second campaign of Aetius near Arles, which it otherwise might not have. We can hardly refuse to accept a Gaulish campaign of Aetius from the witness of a man who talked to Aetius, still campaigning in Gaul, in the year in which it is said to have happened. Under such circumstances, it is more likely that Prosper left something out than that Idatius got so utterly wrong in his date. That is, I think, we must on the whole accept the campaign near Arles in which Aetius took Anawulf as different from the earlier campaign in which Aetius delivered Arles just after the accession of Valentinian.

Now comes a question as to the date of the peace, the peace of which Sidonius speaks in his Panegyric of Avitus, by which Rome gave hostages to the Goth. What we know for certain is that there was a peace which the Goths broke in 436—so witnesses Prosper—and which was in force in 431, when Gothic

was determined by the disputed succession to the Empire; but was his attack on the chief city of the Empire in Gaul meant as throwing off his allegiance to the Empire, or as taking this or that side in the struggle for its sovereignty? Atawulf and Wallia had always been the loyal officers of some Emperor, though in Atawulf's case it had sometimes been an Emperor of his own setting up. A later historian of the Goths seems to look on Theodoric as throwing off all obligations to Rome; but this may come only of looking at things with the notions of later times, and Isidore seems to confound this siege with events two years later*. But if Theodoric marched

fœderati served at the defence of Hippo. Granting that we have established two wars by Arles, one out of Prosper, the other out of Idatius, after which of them came the peace broken in 436? The later date is surely the more likely. The immediate service of the Goths in Africa might well be one of its terms, and, if this were so, the giving of hostages on the side of the victorious Romans becomes more intelligible.

In one of the fragments of Merobaudes' prose Panegyric on Aetius (p. 10), there is an account of a victory won by Aetius over Goths. The circumstances of the story, as the sudden attack, seem to agree very well with the first victory of 425, and I have therefore ventured to make use of some of Merobaudes' details in describing it.

* Isidore, in the Chronicon Gothorum, p. 716, has the following account;

"Theodorides . . . . regno Aquitanico non contentus, pacis Romanæ fœdus recusat; municipia Romanorum vicina sedibus suis occupat. Arelas, nobilissimum Galliæ oppidum, vi multa obsessum oppugnat, a cujus obsidione imminente virtute Aetii Romanæ militiæ ducis non impunitus discedit."

Some phrases here sound like improvements on Prosper; the

on Arles in the character of a partisan of either claimant of the Empire, of which claimant was it? It has been inferred that whatever he did was done, in name at least, on behalf of the legitimate sovereigns, that is, of Theodosius, Placidia, and Valentinian*. It is easy to guess, but it is hard to determine on points like these, where our evidence is so meagre and obscure. One might easily imagine that, when John was acknowledged as Emperor in Italy and Gaul, it might suit the purposes of the Gothic king to profess loyalty to the princes who had no foothold west of the Hadriatic; but what we do know for certain is that the lieutenant of those princes dealt with him as an enemy. With whatever motives or objects, Theodoric laid siege to the noblest city of the Gauls, as one writer admiringly calls it. We gather some details from the panegyric of a devout admirer of Aetius to whom the tale was brought as the last piece of news from the West to one who was sojourning far away on the eastern side of Hadria beside the inland sea of Long Salona†.

piece about the "municipia" is an actual quotation; but it is a quotation from the entry under 436. Isidore clearly rolled the events of that year and those of 425 together.

* Dahn, K. G. v. 73; "Ergriff Theodorich die Waffen, wie es scheint, angeblich für den legitimen Kaiser, in Wahrheit aber im eigenen Interesse." So in his Urgeschichte, p. 357.

† Merobaudes, p. 10; "Delatus ego in angusti litoris sinum, qua Salonas usque per anfractus terræ pronum pelagus inlabitur, nactus sum quemdam qui se tuis recentibus gestis interfuisse memoraret." Salona nowadays seems a strange place to go to for the last news from Arles; but the great saying of Atawulf at Narbonne came to us by way of Bethlehem.

The whole force of the Goths went forth with their king: from the camp before Arles they wandered hither and thither among the marshes and islands which surrounded the city of the waters, eager to gather spoil from every corner of the Roman land *. But the avenger was upon them. Aetius, at the last stage, as it would seem, of his march from Italy, found them busy in the work of plunder by one of the isolated hills which formed so marked a feature in the land which surrounds Arles to the north-east. Was it the famous hill of Montmajour, the rocky hill to be in after days crowned by a mighty monastery, a monastery and yet a fortress, over whose cloister rises conspicuous to all eyes, not the peaceful bell-tower of the church, but the stern keep of the abbatial castle? Or was it the yet more rugged hill by its side, the hill of Cordes, with its mysterious monument of earlier days, the giants' chamber, not, as elsewhere, piled up of massy stones, but hewn, like lesser tombs, in the heart of the living rock? One or other of these hills then bore the name of the Mount of Nadders, and by its foot the admirers of Aetius were able to say, with some confusion of metaphors, that the poisons of the republic were overthrown †. The

* Merobaudes, p. 10; "Gothorum, inquit, manus universa cum rege exierat Romana populatum. Hoc ut dux comperit—jam non expectavi ut diceret, progressus est, manum contulit; neque enim hæc a te acta dubitabam."

† Ib.; "Quæsivi statim ubi, qualiter, quantosque fudisses. Tunc ille, ad montem, inquit, quem Colubrarium quasi præscia vocavit antiquitas; in eo enim nunc reipublicæ venena prostrata sunt maxima." This Mount of Nadders near Arles reminds one of

plunderers were attacked, driven away, and chased. Some of the Goths who stood firm had to yield to the assault of the Roman army. King Theodoric himself came with the rest of his force, seemingly his horse, to be struck with sudden horror as he found his horse's hoofs trampling on the bodies of his men*. At this stage our more detailed and picturesque narrative breaks off. We wish for some picture of the flight of Theodoric, of the entry of Aetius into the ransomed city. But we have evidence enough that the head of Gaul was saved. The towers of Constantine rising above the waters, the theatre of the Greek, the arena of the Roman, the basilica of the saint from Ephesus, were not as yet to pass into barbarian hands. Theodoric and Aetius had had their first meeting in arms; the Goth was driven back, and he and his host paid their penalty for their inroad on Roman lands†.

This first undoubted Gaulish exploit of Aetius is placed immediately after the proclamation of Valentinian as Emperor (425). The siege and deliverance of Arles took place in the same year as the fall of

"Mons Ranarum," William of Malmesbury's name for Brent Knoll in Somerset.

* Merobaudes, p. 10; "Hostium partem improvisus, ut solet, neci dedit, *fusisque peditum copiis* quæ plurimæ erant ipse palantes turmas persecutus, stantes robore, fugientes alacritate compressit. Nec multo post rex ipse cum reliquis copiis suis adfuit, defixus horrore subito calcata prope cadavera." This reads as if Theodoric was on horseback.

† See the words of Prosper, followed by Isidore, in note, pp. 276–8.

John and the transfer of Aetius to the side of Valentinian. Most likely he was sent straight from Ravenna to deliver Arles. It is hard to say what was the end of this war. The next event that we hear of, at Arles, not long after the deliverance of the city from Theodoric, was a disturbance which connects itself with several events both ecclesiastical and temporal. The year before the Gothic siege had seen the slaughter of a high military officer in the capital of Gaul; the year after it saw the slaughter of a bishop (426). Patroclus, Bishop of Arles, is a man of doubtful character. A special partisan and friend of Constantius, he made his way into the see in the year 412, in the room of his predecessor Eros or Heros. Heros, described as a holy man and a disciple of Saint Martin, is said to have been unjustly driven out to make way for Patroclus; but the thing to be noticed is that the irregular deposition and election is not attributed to Constantius himself, but is said to have been the act of the people of Arles, who wished to win the favour of Constantius by the elevation of his friend *. Others speak more favourably of Patroclus and less

* Prosper, 412; "Heros vir sanctus et beati Martini discipulus, cum Arelatensi oppido episcopus præsideret, a populo ipsius civitatis, insons et nulli insimulationi obnoxius, pulsus est, inque ejus locum Patroclus ordinatus, amicus et familiaris Constantii magistri militum, cujus per ipsum gratia quærebatur. Quæ res inter episcopos regionis illius magnarum discordiarum causa fuit." See Tillemont, vi. 186, 188. In "Prosper Tiro" (414) Patroclus is charged with simony; "Infami mercatu sacerdotia venditare ausus."

favourably of Heros *; in any case we can hardly avoid the suspicion that the different estimates of the sanctity of these bishops have a political origin, that the fault of Heros was to have been a partisan of Constantine, as he can hardly fail to have been the bishop by whom the tyrant was admitted to the priesthood in the vain hope of saving his life. What we are really concerned with here is the fact that Patroclus, now (426) acknowledged Bishop of Arles, was killed, seemingly in a brutal fashion, by a barbarian tribune, and that the deed was believed to have been done at the secret bidding of the *magister militum* Felix †. This Felix seems to have succeeded Castinus in his office, and his name appears constantly in the annals for some time to come. He was now the enemy of Boniface; before long he became the enemy of Aetius, and in that character Aetius knew how to deal with him. But save this slaughter of the intruding bishop, the acts of Felix have little reference to Gaul. His relations with Aetius, and the singular way in which some of his acts seem to have been transferred to Aetius, I have dealt with elsewhere.

A few years later (430–31) we hear of another victory won by Aetius over certain Goths in the neighbourhood of Arles, in which Anawulf, one of their chief

* Art. Heros in Dict. Christ. Biog.

† Prosper, 426; "Patroclus Arelatensis episcopus a tribuno quodam barbaro multis vulneribus laniatus occiditur, quod facinus ad occultam jussionem Felicis magistri militum referebatur." Felix was also charged with the death of a holy deacon named Titus at Rome.

men, was taken *. The war of which this was the chief event was, it would seem, ended by a formal peace between the Goths and the Empire. For shortly after that time we find the Goths in their old relation of Roman allies and acting as such in the wars of Africa. While Gothic volunteers swelled the forces of Gaiseric in the siege of Hippo, Gothic *fœderati* helped in the defence of the city. Some of the terms of the peace seem to have been less favourable to the Empire than might have been looked for from these accounts of the victories of Aetius. But we hear of the peace only in incidental notices. A sober annalist, in recording the next war, implies that the present one had been ended by a treaty †. From our poet and rhetorician, our præfect and bishop, we learn something of its details. One is the important fact that the Roman gave hostages to the Goth. We here get our first glimpse of a future Emperor, an Emperor less famous in the annals of the Empire than in the panegyric of his dutiful son-in-law. Yet Avitus of Auvergne played a considerable part in the affairs of his time, and he perhaps better deserved than most of his contemporaries to have a pedigree devised for him which made him a patrician of Rome in an older sense than that in which that title was borne by Aetius ‡. Perhaps only immediate personal danger could justify one of such descent and for whom such

* See the extract from Idatius in note, p. 276.

† Prosper, 436; "Gothi pacis placita perturbant."

‡ That is, if we accept Mr. Hodgkin's explanation of the lines in the Panegyric on Avitus, 155–7.

prospects were in store in crushing the skull of the nurse of Rome with the biggest stone that his boyish arms could wield *. The wild boar, which he smote like another Alcides, the birds of the air, which, like later princes, he loved to subdue by the help of their trained fellows, would in Roman eyes be a more becoming prey †. His studies of Cicero enabled him, while yet a youth, to win the ear of Constantius, not yet Augustus, but already commanding in Gaul, and to obtain a remission of taxes for his native Auvergne, then suffering from the cruelties of Agrætius after the fall of Jovius and Sebastian ‡.

* Sidonius tells the story in the Panegyric, 177.

† His bodily exercises are recorded in 173. The wild boar comes in 183–94. The lines on hawking (202) are curious; they have such a mediæval sound; yet hawking was not a new thing;

> "Quid volucrum studium det quas natura rapaces
> In vulgus prope cognatum? Quis doctior isto
> Instituit varias per nubila jungere lites?
> Alite vincit aves, celerique per æthera plausu
> Hoc nulli melius pugnator militat unguis."

‡ His studies, specially of Cicero, come in 183-94; the mission to Constantius in 207;

> "Nec minus hæc inter, civilia jura secutus,
> Eligitur primus, juvenis, solus, mala fractæ
> Alliget ut patriæ, poscatque informe recidi
> Vectigal; procerum tum forte potentior illic,
> Post etiam princeps, Constantius omnia præstat,
> Indole defixus tanta, et miratur in annis
> Parvis grande bonum, vel in ore precantis ephebi
> Verba senis."

Sirmond in his note well points out that the reference must be

He was now able to win equal favour in the eyes of the Gothic king. Of one of the hostages given to Theodoric we know the name; it was the Greek name so easily confounded with his own; its bearer was Theodorus, a kinsman of Avitus, and therefore doubtless a man of Auvergne *. It might even be inferred from some of the expressions of the poet that the land of Auvergne had been at some stage of the strife the scene of warfare, and had suffered severely from Gothic invasion. In any case, whether simply to visit Theodore in his captivity or to take steps for his release, Avitus came to seek him, doubtless in Gothic Toulouse. There, in the city from which all signs of Roman and Gothic rule have been swept away, must have been the hall of him whom Sidonius speaks of as the king clothed with skins †. His daring in the cause of friendship and kindred gained him the King's good opinion and good will. Theodoric tried to win Avitus to his own service; and he wondered and approved of the constancy of the new Fabricius

to the doings in Auvergne recorded by Renatus; cp. Greg. Tur. ii. 9 (p. 76).

* Sidonius, 215;

> "Variis incussa procellis
> Bellorum regi Getico tua Gallia pacis
> Pignora jussa dare est; inter quas nobilis obses,
> Tu, Theodore, venis."

† Ib. 218;

> . . . . "Quem pro pietate propinqui
> Expetis in media pelliti principis aula
> Tutus, Avite, fide."

who, keenly as he felt the duty of a friend, held the duty of a Roman yet dearer *.

* Sidonius, 220 ;

. . . . "Probat hic jam Theudoris altum
Exemplum officii ; res mira et digna relatu,
Quod fueris blandus regi placuisse feroci.
Hinc te paulatim prælibat sensibus imis,
Atque animis : vult esse suum ; sed spernis amicum,
Plus quam Romanum gerere. Stupet ille repulsam,
Et plus inde places. Rigidum sic, Pyrrhe, videbas
Fabricium," &c.

VIII.

[CHLODOWIG THE FRANK.]

It was a heathen conqueror who had swept away the last traces of independent Roman dominion in Gaul. The unbaptized Chlodowig had displaced the Christian Syagrius as the master of Roman Soissons and Paris. But the Frank stood in a special relation both to Rome and to Christianity. He was not the avowed enemy of either. We can never get clear of the dim likelihood that it was as a Roman officer warring with a tyrant that he overthrew the Roman king. We have the certainty that at a later time he was the friend of the Emperor, honoured at his hands with the highest of Roman honours. The conquest of the land which had been the last Gaulish Romania, the land which was to be the special Gaulish Francia, had been a simple conquest and no more. It had not been marked by havoc and desolation, by the ruin of cities, or by the driving out of the inhabitants of the land. Men and things took their chance in the course of actual warfare, things sacred and profane took their chance together. But the very story which sets before us Frankish warriors as plunderers of a church and dividers of its spoils also

sets before us the Frankish king as one whom a Christian bishop would freely approach, to whom he could make his prayer as a friend, and find it listened to in a friendly spirit. Chlodowig, like Childeric before him, may or may not have known anything of the special doctrines of Christianity; but they at least knew it and recognized it as the religion of Rome, as the creed and worship of Roman neighbours and allies, in the new state of things, of Roman subjects. To Chlodowig the Christian religion was part of the general Roman life, along with the laws, customs, and language which went to make up that Roman life. With no part of that Roman life was he called on to interfere. The Frank went on living according to his law, and the Roman was left to live according to his. We have no such picture of northern Gaul under the heathen Chlodowig as we have of Italy under the Arian Theodoric; but allowing for broad differences in the circumstances of the men and of the lands, the general relations of the Roman and the Teuton must have been the same in each case. There was to be sure this special difference, that the presence and the rule of the heretic awakened a deeper grudge than the presence and rule of the heathen. It is the undying difference between the domestic traitor and the foreign enemy. The worshipper of Jupiter or Woden stood wholly outside the Church; he had never rebelled against her. The Goth, cleaving to the teaching of his first apostle, strong in that national creed which he looked on as the Catholic faith*, had in truth rebelled just as

* See the decree of the Arian Council of Toledo in 581 (Joh.

little. But the orthodox Roman was not likely to make such a distinction; to him the Arian Goth would seem one who had wilfully gone astray from the true fold; the heathen Frank was simply one who, more perhaps through his misfortune than his fault, had never entered it. The Catholics throughout Gaul looked on the still heathen Chlodowig as at least not their enemy, as, if not their friend, at least their impartial protector. He could not fail to become before long the enemy of the heretic, and in that character they were ready to welcome him. We are distinctly told that the Roman subjects of the Goth sought for the Frank as their ruler, even while he still worshipped the gods of his fathers*. But how much greater the gain if he who stood outside the fold could be prevailed on to come within it. The conversion of the outside stranger was far more hopeful than the conversion of the domestic rebel. And a Catholic sovereign somewhere was sorely needed, when every Teutonic king was either heathen or heretic and when the Emperor himself was deemed to have strayed from the narrow path of orthodoxy. To win the Frankish king to Christianity, and that in its orthodox form, was the dearest wish of all Roman Gaul, and doubtless of every Catholic everywhere

Bielar. ap. Roncalli, ii. 390); "dicens de Romana religione *ad nostram Catholicam fidem* venientes non debere baptizari."

* So at least seems implied in Gregory, ii. 23; "cum jam terror Francorum resonaret in his partibus et omnes eos amore desiderabili cuperent regnare, sanctus Aprunculus, Lingonicæ civitatis episcopus, apud Burgundiones cœpit haberi suspectus." Cf. Sid. Ap. ep. ix. 10. This is in the time of Childeric.

whose thoughts were ever drawn to the state of things in the Gaulish lands.

At no time do we more bitterly lament our lack of a contemporary historian than when we come to the memorable change by which the Frankish king, from an impartial protector from outside, became the eldest son of the Church, the one orthodox sovereign in Christendom, the armed missionary of the faith which he accepted against the heretical powers of Gaul. We have the narrative in Gregory of Tours, but it is not as yet Gregory telling of the deeds of his own day in which he himself took no small part, but Gregory putting together the songs and traditions in which events were preserved eighty years after they happened. As to the great historical event, the profession of Christianity by Chlodowig, there is no kind of doubt; if proof were needed beyond the universal consent of all later Frankish history, the letter in which Bishop Avitus of Vienne congratulates the new proselyte is of itself proof enough. Nor is there any reason to doubt the general outline of the common story in which the conversion of Chlodowig is connected with the influence of his Christian wife Chrotechild and with a victorious battle against the Alamans. It would be perfectly safe to say that Chlodowig, believing that he had found by experience that the God of his wife was stronger than the gods of his fathers and of his enemies, deemed it prudent to put himself on the side of the Power whom he deemed to have given him victory in the battle. So much as this mere verbal tradition alone might be trusted to hand down. All is natural; all is pro-

bable; there is nothing to contradict the main story; there is nothing to suggest doubt about it. Some details may be legendary; some are clearly mistakes; but when we put the story to the severest critical test, the result is not so much to shake our faith in the story itself, as to make us cast aside some of the less important inferences which have been made from it in modern times. How near Gregory's story comes to the truth we can best see when we compare it with the wild fictions of later writers. Still we could wish that we had the tale in full, told as Remigius could have told it; that is if Remigius had the same gift for telling the tale of Chlodowig which Gregory had for telling the tale of Chilperic and Guntchramn.

The marriage of Chlodowig to a Christian wife and his conversion to her faith are two chapters in a tale which has a distinct unity. It is the first of a series which stretches over nine hundred years, as long in short as any European nation remained heathen. The Christian and the heathen are unequally yoked together; but the unbelieving husband is won to the faith, and the believing wife is credited with a greater or less share in the good work. The part which Chrotechild plays in the conversion of the Frank is played again by her great-granddaughter in Kent and by the Kentish queen's daughter in Northumberland; long after comes Dombrowka in Poland, and the line is ended when the Lithuanian Jagello, in his new shape as Christian Wladislaf, wins alike the Polish queen and the Polish crown. That such

a means of conversion could be brought to bear, in other words that the daughter of a Christian prince could, without any violent shock, without any marked feeling of utter incongruity, become the wife of a heathen prince, marks a state of things which has passed away. It passed away when the last European prince and people embraced Christendom; in other words, Jagello was not only the last of the line, but there could not be another. The marriage of a heathen king with a Christian king's daughter could happen only when there was no very broad distinction between the manners, the culture, and the general position of Christian and heathen nations. In our age the idolater differs from the Christian, not only in religion and speech, but in every point of moral and physical difference which can keep men apart from each other. Black, red, or yellow, he is either a mere savage, or else, as in China, he is the representative of a culture which boasts itself to be older and deems itself to be higher than that of Europe, which at any rate keeps itself utterly distinct from that of Europe. The Mussulman, nearer in everything than the idolater, is parted at least as thoroughly by his very nearness. Christendom and Islam are more distinctly enemies, because more distinctly rivals, than has ever been the case between any other two religious systems. But in the ages of which we speak the Christian and the heathen were parted from one another by little besides their differences in religion and some immediate consequences of that difference. Christian and heathen belonged to one great family of nations; they

were often near akin in blood and speech; their feelings, habits, traditions, were in many things the same; the Christian Teuton, above all, had over the heathen Teuton no advantage save that of his Christianity itself and of that deeper picture of Roman culture which his Christianity implied. There was nothing shocking, nothing repulsive, about the heathen beyond the fact of his heathendom; he was not an utter stranger, but an erring brother, a brother too whose error was the pardonable one of cleaving to those once common traditions which the Christian had cast aside. The same causes which, a few centuries later, made the missionary work of Christian Teutons among their heathen kinsfolk so immeasureably easier than the work of modern European missionaries has ever been among nations wholly strangers to Europe, made this particular form of conversion specially easy. When Chlodowig, already lord of a Roman land, sought for a bride in a Christian and princely house, there could have been nothing about him except his heathendom that could shock either her or her kinsfolk. The mere thought of such an alliance on his part showed, if not that he was inclined to accept the faith of his bride, at any rate that he had no hostile feelings towards it. As long therefore as any part of Europe clave to heathendom, this kind of marriage, with the religious and political consequences which were apt to follow from it, happened ever and anon. The process impressed men's minds; a Christian wife must convert her heathen husband. Where history failed legend could supply its place; Sira must have con-

verted Chosroes, and a tale of the conversion of Chosroes grew up *. And we see a kind of shadow of the type of conversion which began with Chrotechild in the cases where the husband has to be won over, not from the worship of false gods, but from some form of Christianity which is deemed imperfect. Thus among the Lombards the Catholic Theodelind is held to have won over the Arian Agilulf; thus English Margaret—so at least the English chronicler thought—was needed to bring the household and kingdom of Scottish Malcolm to a fuller understanding of the right way †. But among all such tales, the tale with which we are now concerned, the tale of the wooing and wedding of Frankish Chlodowig and Burgundian Chrotechild, stands out as the first and the most famous.

It is perhaps dull work, after tracing out the effect of the marriage, the victory, and the conversion of Chlodowig on the general history of Gaul and the world, to turn to examine the exact geographical and political relations between the Franks and their Alamannian neighbours. They have been the subject of a good deal of research and discussion at the hands of modern scholars. That so it should be is not wonderful when we have the whole story in a fragmentary, and partly a legendary form. The

* The story is told by Fredegar, Chron. 9, under the year 588, and by Paul the Deacon, Hist. Lang. iv. 52, with a much more confused chronology. John of Bielar (Roncalli, ii. 398) mentions the supposed conversion of Chosroes under the year 590. The groundwork of the whole legend will be found in Evagrius, vi. 21.

† See the English Chronicle, D. 1067, and Norman Conquest, iv, p. 510.

great tale which became the national epic of the Christian Franks looks at the war with the Alamans simply as the occasion of the conversion of the Frankish king. Its causes and details, the exact date and the exact place of the struggle, were matters of no importance. They might have formed the subject of a poem of their own ; as it was, they were lost in the greater tale of the conversion. In attempting to put together a narrative of the Alamannian war we must take the story as handed down to us, a story trustworthy in the main, and enlarge and illustrate it from our other sources. The main point in which the story as usually told might lead us astray would be if we were led to think that the victory of Chlodowig which led to his conversion was at once followed by the complete submission of the whole nation of the Alamans to the Frankish power. On the other hand there can be little doubt that there were several wars between Franks and Alamans on the part both of Chlodowig and of other Frankish princes, and that two distinct campaigns and victories of Chlodowig have been rolled together in one. The battle in which Chlodowig first called on the God of his wife was formerly placed at Zülpich on the Lower Rhine, on the strength of a notice by which it appears that the Ripuarian King Sigeberht received a wound in a battle with the Alamans at that place *. But it is now generally allowed that these two battles are quite distinct.

* The whole story of the wars of the Franks and Alamans is discussed by Hans von Schubert, Die Unterwerfung der Alamannen

We can only guess whether they were parts of a joint campaign on the part of the two Frankish kings, for the warfare of Sigeberht is recorded incidentally, without date or circumstance. But the place of battle, so far to the north, certainly looks like an invasion of the Ripuarian territory on the part of the Alamans. The site of Chlodowig's battle, on the other hand, without being exactly fixed, can be placed with reasonable confidence in a land far to the south. From another legend, which brings in Saint Vedast, afterwards Bishop of Arras, as an agent in the conversion of the Frank, it appears that the battle was fought near the Rhine at some point from which the Frankish army could be said to go back to Toul on their way to Rheims. This is wholly impossible for Zülpich, and points to Chlodowig's battle as fought at some point between Toul and the Rhine, that is pretty certainly, in the Alamannian land of Elsass. The march of Chlodowig was made to the Rhine with the purpose of crossing it into the main Alamannian land beyond; but he was met by the Alamannian army. The victory is

unter den Franken, Strassburg, 1884. His views are accepted by Hodgkin, Italy and her Invaders, vol. ii.

Other views are maintained by Junghaus, Die Geschichte der fränkischen Könige Childerich und Chlodovich, Göttingen, 1857 (translated, with some fresh notes, by G. Monod, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, 37me Fascicule, Paris, 1879). This first point seems perfectly clear. There is nothing in Gregory, ii. 30, to fix Chlodowig's battle to any particular place, nor any reason to infer that that was the battle referred to in the incidental reference in ii. 37 ("Sigebertus pugnans contra Alamannos percussus in geniculo claudicabat").

won for the Frank by his prayer to the God of Chrotechild; the Alamannian king and his people submit —the death of the king, usually placed at this stage, comes later—he marches back to Toul, and thence to Rheims, accompanied, according to this account, by Vedast, who confirms his faith on the road, at Vouziers on the Aisne, by the miracle of restoring a blind man to sight *. The miraculous story must share the fate, whatever that fate is ruled to be, of other miraculous stories; but the geography of the story is probable and uncontradicted. The Alamannian territory stretched on both sides of the Rhine; Chlodowig designed to carry the war into the lands beyond the river, but was met by the enemy on the western side. That this first war did not lead to a complete conquest is paralleled by both the Roman and the Burgundian campaigns of Chlodowig. Submission, with some cession of territory, was the

* The Life of Saint Vedast is printed in full by Schubert. In cc. 2, 3 we read how Chlodowig goes against the Alamans; "Quo cum venisset hac utroque acies, et nisi obviam hostem habuisset Reni alveum trassire vellet, cumque ergo utrumque hostium chunei adstarent," &c. Then follows the battle, the vow, the victory. Then "Chlodoves victor deinde Alamannos cum rege in dicionem cœpit ovansque ad patriam festinus rediens ad Tullum oppidum venit." There he finds Vedast, "quem mox sibi itinere juncxit; dum pariter pergerent, quadam die venerunt in pago Vongise ad locum qui dicitur Grandeponte juxta villam Riguliac, super fluvium Axono" (on the river Aisne, in the department of Ardennes), where the miracle happens; thence they go to Rheims, and the baptism follows. The geography is quite consistent.

The writer of this Life, according to Schubert, was a contemporary of Gregory, writing about 580. His forms of proper names have a philological value.

natural result of a first success. The northern Alamannian land on the Main and Neckar seems now to have passed under Frankish rule, while the whole Alamannian nation accepted Frankish supremacy *.

The second Alamannian war of Chlodowig is nowhere recorded; but its historical character is abundantly proved by several passages in the despatches of Cassiodorus which refer to a war between Franks and Alamans, and to a settlement of Alamans under East-Gothic protection which chronology forbids us to refer to the war which led to Chlodowig's conversion †. A letter addressed to the Frankish king

* This seems the general result; but the exact boundaries are not of great importance for our subject.

† The real point on which the whole question turns is a very subtle point of chronology. *Cassiodorus could not have written any letter in the name of Theodoric while the war of* 496 *was still fresh.* He was not in a position to write any such letter till after his father's appointment as prætorian præfect in 500. (See Hodgkin, Letters of Cassiodorus, 12.) He then became *Consiliarius* to his father, and quæstor. This seems plain from the Anecdota Holderi, p. 4; "Juvenis adeo, dum patris Cassiodori patricii et præfecti prætorii consiliarius fieret et laudes Theodorichi regis Gothorum facundissime recitasset ab eo quæstor est factus." Now it seems clear from the Anonymus Valesii that the elder Cassiodorus, though his name is not mentioned, was appointed præfect during Theodoric's six months' stay at Rome; "Liberium præfectum prætorii quem fecerat in initio regni sui fecit patricium, et dedit ei successorem in administrationem præfecturæ." But the visit of Theodoric to Rome was, according to Cassiodorus' own Chronicle, in the consulship of Patricius and Hypatius; that is in the year 500 A.D. The letters written by Cassiodorus the younger in the king's name could therefore hardly begin till the year 501 or 502. It follows therefore that the letter in the Variæ, ii. 41, cannot refer to the war of 496, as it refers to a war which was hardly

in the name of his friend and kinsman Theodoric the East-Goth. The language of the letter, if it is not to be taken as mere words of courtesy from one prince to another, would most naturally imply that the war had been provoked by a breach of faith on the part of the Alamans, which is most easily understood of a breach of the treaty by which the former war was ended *. Theodoric congratulates his brother-in-law on his victory, a victory which had carried with it the death of the Alamannian king and the slaughter and bondage of a large part of his people. For the rest he prays for mercy; he pleads the example of his own victories, and specially calls on Chlodowig to abstain from any hostile act to those of the vanquished who have sought shelter in his own dominions †. Other documents show that these

over; that is to say, there must have been a second war between Franks and Alamans in 501 or 502.

After long weighing of the arguments of Junghaus and Schubert, I had a good deal of difficulty in accepting a second and unrecorded war; but it seems impossible to escape this series of chronological reasoning.

* Cass. Var. ii. 41; "Gloriosa quidem vestræ virtutis affinitate gratulamur, quod gentem Francorum *prisca ætate residem*, feliciter in nova prælia concitastis, et Alamannicos populos, cæsis fortioribus inclinatos, victrici dextra subdidistis. Sed quoniam semper in auctoribus perfidiæ resecabilis videtur excessus, nec primariorum plectibilis culpa omnium debet esse vindicta, motus vestros in confessas reliquias temperate." These words, which could only have been written immediately after the victory, may not necessarily imply a breach of a treaty by the Alamans, but it looks most like it. The words in italics are equally wonderful in 496 and in 501.

† Ib.; "Jure gratiæ merentur evadere quos ad parentum

were not a mere handful of fugitives, but a considerable part of the Alamannian nation which was now admitted to new settlements within the former Roman territory under the protection of the East-Gothic king, on whom the rights and duties of Roman sovereignty had fallen. In that character the Danube was his northern frontier, the frontier of Italy in its widest sense as a præfecture *. In the lands, it would seem, between the Alps and the Danube, in parts of Rhætia, Noricum, and the eastern lands of Helvetia, the Alamans found new seats as subjects and soldiers of the Gothic king †. So matters seem to have rested during the remainder of the days of the two great conquerors. In this, as in all other

vestrorum defensionem respicitis confugisse. Estote illis remissi, qui nostris finibus cœlantur exterriti." *Parentes* here takes in a brother-in-law.

* Ennodius, Paneg. 15 (p. 212, ed. Vogel); "A te Alamanniæ generalitas intra Italiæ terminos sine detrimento Romanæ possessionis inclusa est, cui evenit habere regem postquam meruit perdidisse. Facta est Latiaris custos imperii semper nostrorum populatione grassata, cui feliciter cessit fugisse patriam suam; nam sic adepta est soli nostri opulentiam. Adquisistis quæ noverit ligonibus tellus adquiescere, quamvis nos contigerit damna nescire." There has been much speculation as to the exact force of "generalitas" and other words in this passage. Without entering into details, it clearly implies a considerable body of settlers planted, one would think, both to till and to do garrison duty on a wasted frontier. The most instructive thing after all is the way in which the rule of Theodoric is assumed to be a Roman rule, and the whole extent of his dominions to be Italy. The *præfectura* of Italy, we must not forget, reached to the Danube.

† For the exact geographical discussion I must refer generally to Junghaus, Schubert, and others, whom it more immediately concerns.

cases, it was the policy of Theodoric, at once first of Teutonic kings and representative of Roman power in the West, to hinder either the excessive aggrandizement or the utter destruction of any one of the kingdoms and nations among which he bore himself as chief. It was his first call to interfere or to mediate among the powers of Gaul. The overthrow of Syagrius had happened before the march of Theodoric into Italy. Had it been otherwise, we might possibly have some clue that we have not now to the positions of both Frank and Roman in the warfare which wiped out the last traces of Roman power in northern Gaul. The first Alamannian war was fought in lands which had long passed away from the Empire which he claimed to represent, and it did not carry with it the destruction of the weaker side. There was therefore no obvious claim for the interference of the master of Italy. It was otherwise with the second war. The Frank was now clearly seeking the destruction or utter subjugation of the Alamannian people. That in no way fell in with Theodoric's policy, even if the defeated people had not sought shelter within Theodoric's dominions. When they did so, honour and interest alike bade him to defend them against their enemy, and to secure his northern frontier by a garrison of willing defenders who would be bound to him by every tie of gratitude. He says in short to Chlodowig, as he did afterwards more emphatically in the case of the West-Goths; "Thus far shalt thou come and no further." No prince in history ever held a position of greater dignity, or used it with greater moderation,

than Theodoric held his unique place as the common head and protector of Romans and Teutons alike through all the lands of the West. The modern phrase of "balance of power" is hardly worthy of the calm loftiness with which he watched over the interests, not only of his own immediate subjects, but of all the nations which looked up to him as the first among them. This lofty supremacy of influence Theodoric could exercise as none could before or after him. The Roman Augustus stood apart from the barbarians, almost like a being of another nature; he might be sometimes above them, sometimes below; he might seem, in the words of Athanaric, like a god upon earth, or he might be, like Attalus, a mere puppet in their hands, to be set up and put down at pleasure. But Theodoric was one of themselves, the worthiest of their own stock, the elder brother of the great family, while at the same time, Emperor in all but name, he joined to his Gothic kingship, his Teutonic princedom, the whole power and influence and lofty traditions of Rome. The position of Theodoric is nowhere better shown than in his dealings with Chlodowig; when he speaks and acts, even the mighty Frank has at least to pause. The mere warrior and conqueror halts at the bidding of one who, warrior and conqueror no less than himself, is also the ruler, the lawgiver, the judge between contending men and nations. The contrast between the two men is wonderful; the contrast between their works is yet more so. Some instruments seem too noble for the work of this world. The position, the work, of Theodoric was

personal; it died with him. Because he had done for a generation what no other man could do, his work was to pass away with his generation. Chlodowig, a conqueror of a meaner type, was to affect all later generations, to do a work which still abides and which shows no sign of perishing. If his creation has been split asunder, it lives none the less in each of two foreign and often hostile halves. Theodoric lives in the books of Cassiodorus, in the memory of the happy breathing-space that he gave to his Italian realms. Chlodowig lives in all that has come after him, for good and for evil, in the long histories of Germany and France *.

[Here this series of lectures ends, no more being written.]

APPENDIX I.

AETIUS AND BONIFACE.

THE "groans of the Britons" are a familiar flourish of rhetoric, heard of doubtless by many who have never thought of the writing in which the words are found as one of those few precious rays of light which feebly pierce the darkness which covers the fall of Britain and the rise of England. I can remember looking on them in childish days in another light. It may be that I then looked on the groans of the Britons as the groans of men in whom I had a direct interest, as the groans of our forefathers, and not of them whom our forefathers supplanted. But I well remember being puzzled at the description of the person to whom those groans were sent. "Aetius thrice consul" in the middle of the fifth century seemed a strange and contradictory being. We were then taught that the Roman commonwealth came to an end in the year 30 before Christ, as we were taught that the Roman empire came to an end in the year 476 after Christ. In those days a Roman consul—other perhaps than the horse of Gaius Cæsar—after the one mystic year seemed as impossible as a Roman emperor after the other mystic year. What would one have thought in those days if one had lighted on some of those passages in the Spanish annals of the sixth century which tell how the son of a West-Gothic king rebelled against his father and went over to the republic*? Even at a far later

* See John of Biclar in Roncalli, ii. 391, recording the revolt of Eormengild; "Leonegildus rex, filio Hermenegildo ad rempublicam commigrante." That means that he withdrew to the imperial province in

stage of study, it is not without a certain peculiar feeling, a slight survival of the days of ignorance, that we find *respublica*, sometimes *respublica Romana*, sometimes *respublica* as a word which needs no qualifying adjective, used to describe the recovered Western dominion of Justinian and his successors. And, if in the sixth century, how much more in the fifth! If Eormengild could find a Roman republic to flee to in Spain, much more might Aetius a hundred years earlier, when no barbarian king had as yet ruled in Rome or in Ravenna, stand forth on the soil of Gaul and Italy as consul of that republic for the third time. And in after times another thought might be suggested by the superscription of the famous groans. We have learned how much and how little the abiding use of the phrase *respublica* really means, how far apart that use is from the very modern controversial use both of the Latin word and of its English equivalent, the once familiar and honoured name of "commonwealth." We have learned how nearly nominal and formal the function of the Roman consuls and the Roman senate had become in ordinary times when the Roman world was awakened by the Wandering of the Nations. And we have learned too how the very events of the Wandering of the Nations now and then put a new life into the old names and the old forms. In its greatest strait the Roman senate could again put forth powers which were only sleeping, and could treat with Alaric as it had treated of old with Pyrrhos. So now and then a Roman consul too could stand forth as one worthy to bear the title under which a Curius and a Scipio had beaten back the enemies of Rome. In one age the consul Stilicho saved Italy from the hosts of Radagaisus; in another age the consul Belisarius won back Sicily to the allegiance of Augustus. And so in the days between them, it was with a true feeling of the facts of the time, with a sound knowledge

the south of Spain. The phrase is common enough, and goes on into the time of Fredegar and his continuators. It is perhaps strangest of all when Pippin makes Aistulf promise "ut ulterius ad sedem apostolicam Romanam et rempublicam nunquam accederet." Only by this time it is just possible that the faintest change of meaning may have been coming over the word.

of who it was who could really act to destroy or to deliver, that the groans of the Britons went up, in the year 446 after Christ, not to the august lords of all, to Theodosius and Valentinian, but to the true king of men whom they rightly saw in Aetius, son of Gaudentius, in that year for the third time consul of the commonwealth of Rome.

The groans of the Britons are likely to be a very early impression, and the tale that records them does not record any act of Aetius, but rather tells us the reasons why in the affairs of Britain he could not act. Truly it was not even for the man who then held his third consulship, and who lived to be murdered by an ungrateful sovereign in his fourth, to roll back the course of destiny and to decree that Britain should not change into England. He had worthier work to do. He had to be the foremost man on one of the foremost days in the history of the world. No man stands forth with a higher name than his in the most terrible of all the stages of the Eternal Question. Few days indeed in its long story can rise to the greatness of the tremendous issue of the day of the Catalaunian fields. Aetius thrice consul held the torch which had been passed on to him through many earlier hands from Gelôn and Themistoklês, and which he was to pass on through many later hands to Kanarês and to Skobeleff. The Britons groaned in vain when the consul of Rome already saw the approach of Attila looming in the distance *. The Scot might overleap the barrier of Hadrian and Theodosius; the Saxon might harry British and Gaulish coasts from his light keels; Roman, Goth, Frank, Burgundian, with the Saxon too and the Briton as lesser actors, might dispute the possession of every inch of Gaulish soil; all was but as the strife of kites and crows compared with the battle of gods and giants that was coming. Or let us rather look on all disputes within the European world as a friendly strife, a slight practice in the art of giving and taking blows, in face of the great day when

* The consulship of Aetius and Symmachus, the third of Aetius, comes in 446, the year after Attila had succeeded to the sole monarchy of the Huns.

Roman and Goth and Frank were to march forth side by side to do battle with the Hun.

Of the man who was foremost in such a work as this we naturally seek to have some nearer knowledge. And we have no lack of materials for drawing a picture of Aetius; the only drawback is that our materials are somewhat contradictory. He has a career in Gaul and he has a career out of Gaul, and the two, at least as his career out of Gaul is commonly told, may at first sight seem inconsistent. In Gaul he appears as the constant and successful champion of the Roman power against barbarians of every race. He is the defender of Roman cities, the winner back of lost Roman provinces; he is the conqueror of the rebellious or the invading Frank, the guardian of Roman lands against the advancing Goth, till the moment when his diplomacy wins over Goth and Frank to give help against the common enemy. If his exploits are recorded in high-flown strains in the laureate song of Sidonius, they stand out no less clearly in the drier entries of the annalists. In Gaul, if we have to match him as a direct rival against any man, it will be against the West-Gothic king Theodoric. Between Theodoric and Aetius the relations are the honourable relations of the leaders of two nations which may be at any time either friends or enemies, and whom the skill of Aetius in his later days changes from enemies into friends. Out of Gaul Aetius appears rather as the friend of the barbarians than as their enemy; with the Hun above all he appears as united by the closest ties of friendship; he brings his savage allies into Roman lands to support the cause of that claimant of the Roman throne to whose allegiance he has devoted himself. When that claimant is overthrown, he goes over with all speed to the cause of his successful rival; the minister and general of John becomes at once the general of Valentinian in Gaul, the minister and adviser of Placidia at Ravenna. In this last character he is painted, no longer as the national rival of the Gothic king, but as the political and personal rival of the other great Roman of his day. The Roman world cannot contain Boniface and Aetius at once. Aetius uses every base art of intrigue to secure his own power at the imperial court by

driving his rival into treason. His plots are found out; the rivalry between the two leaders goes on, till it is ended by a fight, whether open battle or single combat, the result of which is, in one way or another, the death of Boniface. Aetius can now keep his place only by the help of the Hun; but by the help of the Hun he does keep or regain it. Of this side of him we hardly hear again till after the great defeat of Attila. Then we get two opposite portraits; in one he wins fresh laurels in Italy; in another he counsels the emperor to flee to some other land. In any case he dies, three years after the Catalaunian battle, by the hand of his sovereign, stirred up by his eunuchs to suspicions of the great captain's loyalty.

Of this non-Gaulish side of the life of Aetius, his conduct at the time of the accession of John at Ravenna, his fight with Boniface, and his own murder by Valentinian, are all facts, the main outlines of which rest on good authority. But the long and subtle intrigues of Aetius against Boniface are unknown to the contemporary writers and appear only in the next century. Aetius and Boniface were not always on the same side in politics; they were opposed to one another on two great occasions, the disputed succession to the empire on the death of Honorius and the time when they actually met in arms. But there is nothing in the annalists which asserts or implies any personal quarrel between Aetius and Boniface earlier than this last strife. The enemies of Boniface at court, the men who plot against him, are first Castinus and then Felix. And of these, strangely enough, Felix meets with death by the hand, or at least by the bidding, of Aetius. In all this there is at least enough to make us stop and doubt whether the story of elaborate intrigue and rivalry on the part of Aetius against Boniface can be accepted. And the whole story seems worth sifting in detail. In the life and character of a man who plays such a part as that of Aetius the smallest point is worth examining. There is much too in the character and history of Boniface which clothes all that touches him with deep interest. The career of Aetius, as we have seen, has two sides, which may easily be looked at apart. His acts on this side of the Alps, his campaigns against the barbarians generally,

his great career in Gaul, his slight connexion with Britain, are matters which touch me very deeply as part of the great connected history of Gaul and Britain. But they have little to do with his relations towards Boniface, little to do with his relations towards the imperial court or to the affairs of Italy. Even questions about his personal character are of no great importance from the Gaulish side. In Gaul he is simply a great warrior, the successful defender of the declining empire against all foes. Out of Gaul he is, for good or for evil, something more. I propose therefore, leaving his Gaulish career to be dealt with in another shape, to treat of the general history of the man himself in his other relations, and above all in his relation to his alleged rival Boniface.

As the two are commonly painted—and the picture has in any case many touches of truth in it—the histories of Aetius and Boniface present a singular contrast*. Boniface, the true Roman, so long the special guardian of Rome against barbarians of every race, comes at last to invite barbarians into the province which he had so long guarded, while Aetius, half barbarian by birth and training, largely supported throughout his career by barbarian help, ends as the foremost defender of Europe against the Hun, as he had once been the defender of Roman Gaul against the Goth. In other words, the earlier day of the one, the later day of the other, is his brightest time. In this picture the barbarian relations of Aetius, the strictly Roman position of Boniface, undoubtedly come from the life. But whether we are to accept the contrast in its fulness depends on the question whether Boniface ever did forsake his Roman position—whether, in short, he did invite the Vandal into Africa. In any case there is a contrast between the two of another kind. There is a side of Boniface in which Aetius has no share. Boniface is an ecclesiastical as well as a military hero; he is the friend and correspondent of Augustine. And his relations with the saint bring out many points of the man himself, and set before us the nature of the ecclesiastical influences under which a layman of the highest rank and character

* This reversed comparison is well brought out by Hodgkin, i. 455.

and personal importance could be brought in days when Arles and Carthage were decidedly more Christian than Rome.

The picture of the special rivalry between the two men, of the special intrigues of Aetius against Boniface, seems to come wholly from Procopius' History of the Vandal War. It is not wonderful that a story told by a writer who in his own age ranks among the great masters of history should have won more acceptance than a story which has to be put together from scattered notices in this and that meagre annalist. Yet we must remember that Aetius and Boniface lived in the fifth century, while Procopius wrote in the sixth. Now it in no way takes away from the position of the narrator of the wars of Belisarius as one of the foremost among men who have written the history of their own day that he is not equally trustworthy in dealing with the history of times before his own. Procopius plainly had an inquiring spirit and a keen imagination. He is never an annalist. In the story of the wars he recorded events, many of which happened under his own eyes; he recorded them from his own personal knowledge, or from the statements of those who had personal knowledge. But he was also well pleased to set down all that he could learn of earlier times or of distant countries. And about them his sources of knowledge were often less trustworthy. What he was sometimes made to believe about distant lands we may judge by his famous account of our own land and people. Even in so wild a story as that of Brittia and Bretannia we feel that we are still dealing with a master. The reports that he heard were partly true; when they were, Procopius could grasp the truth and use it, but, as the reports that he heard were partly false, he sets down much fable along with the truth. So with his accounts of earlier times; he grasps with all the true historian's power the position and character of Theodoric, and sets it forth in a few memorable words. But he also sets down many stories for which the evidence is very weak; in stories which are essentially true, he is often misinformed as to details. That is to say, he set down the received tale that he heard, which might be true or false. In other words, he was the soldier and statesman, keen to observe,

cunning to weigh, the events of his own time; he had not the scholar's instinct for a minute examination of the records of earlier times. One famous story which has been received chiefly on his authority, the story of Valentinian and Petronius, has been lately examined and set aside by a master of the history of those times *. But the judgement had been pronounced already by the chief master of all †. In declining to accept Procopius' account of Aetius except so far as it is otherwise confirmed, I only follow their examples. But I may add that this story of long-continued rivalry and intrigue is one which would naturally grow out of the enmity which undoubtedly did at last arise between Aetius and Boniface. We have a parallel case in our own history. Because Harold and Tostig were enemies in the last stage of their lives, legend has painted them as enemies from childhood. We cannot so easily show in the case of Aetius and Boniface as we can in the case of Harold and Tostig, that till the last stage of all there was no enmity between them, but full friendship, nor can we in the same way show how the first enmity arose. The general picture which Procopius gives of the two mighty men, each of whom, if the other had not been, would have been rightly called the last of the Romans, is natural and indeed truthful ‡. Under the circumstances the tale of abiding enmity easily grew up, and when it had once grown up, details, as ever, attached themselves. But they are details of the kind which are always most suspicious, tales of secret intrigues and treasons which could not be known to the world at large. The utmost that they can be admitted to prove is

* Hodgkin, ii. 230.

† Gibbon, cap. xxxv. vi. 135, ed. Milman; "Procopius is a fabulous writer for the events which precede his own memory." Yet he adopts Procopius' story.

‡ Bell. Vand. i. 3 (p. 322); *Τούτω τὼ ἄνδρε διαφόρω μὲν τὰ πολιτικὰ ἐγενέσθην, ἐς τοσοῦτον δὲ μεγαλοψυχίας τε καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀρετῆς ἠκέτην ὥστε, εἴ τις αὐτοῖν ἑκάτερον ἄνδρα Ῥωμαίων ὕστατον εἴποι, οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοι· οὕτω τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἀρετὴν ξύμπασαν ἐς τούτω τὼ ἄνδρε ἀποκεκρίσθαι τετύχηκε.* This illustrates the different uses of the word Ῥωμαῖοι by Procopius. Aetius and Boniface are the last of *οἱ πάλαι* Ῥωμαῖοι, a class different from both the local and the œcumenical Ῥωμαῖοι of his own time.

a general impression that Aetius was a man capable of a subtle plot. And that we can hardly take upon ourselves to deny.

My present object is, holding the account of Procopius, as it stands, to be legend of the sixth century and not trustworthy history of the fifth, to try to recover the true story as it may be put together from the annalists, the writings of Saint Augustine, and other more trustworthy authorities. In this work I have found very little help from earlier writers. The received story seems to be taken for granted by English writers, almost without glancing at the other. Gibbon, well as he knew the slight value of the evidence of Procopius in such a case, not only accepts the story, but hardly notices the evidence of the annalists at all *. It is different with foreign writers. From Ruinart † and Tillemont to "the last German book," which, as far as I know, is that of Dr. Albert Güldenpenning ‡, I have nothing to complain of in the way of neglect of the authors on whom I have to ground my story. The excellent Tillemont, as ever in both his works §, never passes by a fact, never misses a reference. The whole materials, or the way to them, are open before us in his pages, but it is not lacking in respect to our venerable guide to say that they are not dealt with in a critical spirit. And I cannot say that modern German writers have greatly advanced on the old French ecclesiastical writers. All that I have seen who take any notice of the matter seem to think, with Tillemont, that they are bound to believe both Procopius and the annalists, and to force the two into some kind of agreement. I have not picked up very much from writers like Dahn ‖ and Wietersheim ¶, who come to the story casually as part of something

* Cap. xxiii. vol. vi. 8 et seqq., ed. Milman.

† Historia Persecutionis Vandalicæ. Paris, 1694.

‡ Geschichte des oströmischen Reiches unter den Kaisern Arcadius und Theodosius II. Von Dr. Albert Güldenpenning. Halle, 1885.

§ Both the Histoire des Empereurs, vol. vi. Paris, 1738, and the Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles, vol. xiii. (that devoted to Saint Augustine). Paris, 1710.

‖ Könige der Germanen, v. 74.

¶ Geschichte der Völkerwanderung, Band iv. 188, 189.

much longer. A short monograph by Sievers * has helped me to one or two points and references, and the slight mention of the matter by Güldenpenning reveals to me the existence of a German writer, whose book I have not seen—it is not to be found in the Bodleian—but who, I suspect, may to some extent have forestalled me. His name is Hansen, and he published a discourse on Aetius at Dorpat in 1846 †. It is always hard to say anything which some German scholar has not said before one; but if it should turn out that Dr. Hansen and I have, at forty years' interval, come independently to the same results, there will be nothing for either to complain of.

To compare then our two men, we know much more of the early life of Aetius than we do of that of Boniface, but Boniface is the first to appear as a direct actor in history. In the war with Ataulf in Gaul, the war in which Constantius holds the first place on the Roman side, Boniface appears as the hero of a single exploit, and as the object of the highest praise from one of our best authorities for the time. If the narrative of Olympiodôros were less fragmentary, we might better know how it came about that, when Ataulf was besieging Massalia in the year 412, it was Boniface, the noble Boniface, who came to its defence, who with his own hand smote the Gothic king well nigh to death, who made him withdraw to his camp and raise the siege, and remained himself to receive the thanks and praise of the rescued city ‡. This exploit stands by itself; ten years later we hear of him again in a character which more directly connects itself with our present subject. In 422 an expedition is fitting out in Italy against the Vandals in Spain, of which Castinus, the consul of two years later, is the commander. We read in somewhat dark language how Castinus,

* Studien zur Geschichte der römischen Kaiser. Berlin, 1870, p. 454 et al.

† Güldenpenning, 280.

‡ Olymp. 456. Ataulf besieges Massalia, *ἔνθα πληγεὶς, Βονηφατίου τοῦ γενναιοτάτου βαλόντος, καὶ μόλις τὸν θάνατον διαφυγὼν, εἰς τὰς οἰκείας ὑπεχώρησε σκηνὰς, τὴν πόλιν ἐν εὐθυμίᾳ λιπὼν, καὶ δι' ἐπαίνων καὶ εὐφημίας ποιουμένην Βονηφάτιον.* Olympiodôros speaks with special admiration of Boniface.

by misconduct of some kind, by unreasonable and wrongful orders, hindered Boniface, the man so renowned for warlike skill, from taking a share in the enterprise, how Boniface refused to follow such a leader, one so proud and quarrelsome, how he suddenly sailed from Portus to Africa, and how this dispute between the generals was the beginning of great evils to the commonwealth *. Another annalist tells us of the failure of Castinus in his Spanish campaign; he says nothing directly of any relations between Castinus and Boniface, but a few significant words follow, the force of which can hardly be given except in the original—"Bonifacius palatium deserens Africam invadit †." This last word is emphatic and notable; it is then, and long after ‡, a kind of technical term for unjust or unlawful occupation of anything, from a crown downwards. It seems plain that Boniface did not go on the enterprise on which we must suppose that Valentinian or Placidius had sent him, that he left Ravenna and Italy in anger, and, if the entry stood by itself, we should be tempted to infer that he seized on Africa as tyrant, that he began in short the same part that Constantine played a few years before in Britain, Gaul, and Spain. His conduct directly after shows that this can hardly be; but the words of both annalists read as if he took possession of the government of Africa when the imperial orders would have sent him elsewhere. We are left to make out from these dark hints whether Boniface was already in command in Africa, and was summoned thence to Ravenna to take part in the imperial counsels and in the Spanish expedition, or whether, according, as we have seen, to the words of

* Prosper; "Honorio XIII et Theodosio X Coss. Hoc tempore exercitus ad Hispanias contra Vandalos missus est, cui Castinus dux fuit, qui Bonifacium virum bellicis artibus præclarum, inepto et injurioso imperio ab expeditionis suæ societate avertit. Nam ille periculosum sibi atque indignum ratus eum sequi quem discordem superbientemque expertus esset, celeriter se ad portum Urbis, atque inde ad Africam *proripuit*, idque reipublicæ multorum laborum initium fuit."

† Idatius, xxvii. Honorii, A.D. 421.

‡ I need not say that "invadere," "invasio," are among the commonest Domesday phrases for unlawful occupation of every kind. So "regnum invasit" is the set Norman phrase for the accession of Harold.

one chronicler, he in the strict sense seized on Africa. The former explanation fits in better with his later conduct; but the use of so strong a word as *invadit* must not be forgotten. It is at least hardly consistent with the picture which some draw of Boniface as a model of unswerving loyalty.

One thing is clear, namely that, at whatever time and by whatever means Boniface obtained the chief command in Africa, he won the highest reputation by his conduct there, as he had already done at some time when he was in the same land in an inferior military rank. As a simple tribune, in command of a few allied troops, he had, so his correspondent Saint Augustine witnesses, successfully beaten back the invasions of the barbarians *. Olympiodôros paints his picture with glowing enthusiasm. Boniface is a hero, foremost in many strifes with many barbarians; ready alike to act with few, with many, or with his own single arm, he had cleared Africa of many enemies of various races †. He loved right and hated greediness; the same tale is told of him which is told of Sultan Mahmoud; a soldier of his army had taken possession of the house and wife of a countryman; the injured man makes his moan to Boniface; the avenger speeds by night to the farm seventy stadia off, and is able the next day to give the head of the adulterer to his suppliant ‡. The state of things in the African province must have needed reform, when wrong could be punished only in this sultan-like fashion; still it was something to have a general who was ready to protect the provincial against the soldier in any way. For all this picture of Boniface we have no date §;

* Aug. Ep. ccxx. [70], ad Bon.; "Bonifacius . . . tribunus cum paucis fœderatis omnes ipsas gentes [Afros barbaros] expugnando et terrendo pacaverat."

† Olymp. 468; *Βονηφάτιος ἀνὴρ ἦν ἡρωϊκὸς καὶ κατὰ πολλῶν πολλάκις βαρβάρων ἠρίστευεν, ἄλλοτε μὲν σὺν ὀλίγοις ἐπερχόμενος, ἄλλοτε δὲ καὶ σὺν πλείοσιν, ἐνιότε δὲ καὶ μονομαχῶν, καὶ ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν, παντὶ τρόπῳ πολλῶν βαρβάρων καὶ διαφόρων ἐθνῶν ἀπήλλαξε τὴν Ἀφρικήν. ἦν δὲ καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἐραστὴς καὶ χρημάτων κρείττων.* ‡ Ib.

§ Tillemont (Mém. Eccl. xiii. 712) fixes these early deeds of Boniface to about the year 417. He certainly had a great military reputation as early as 422.

as a time came when his administration in Africa ceased to deserve this unqualified praise, we may conceive that this his most brilliant time came before, or at least did not last long after, the next time when we hear of any action of his that can be assigned to any definite consulship. This comes in 424, when we find Boniface in Africa, resisting the claims of John to the Western throne. In the absence of any direct hint that he was seeking the tyranny for himself, we must suppose that he was avowedly supporting the rights of the Theodosian house; yet the language of our one authority is very remarkable. Its tone is more favourable to John than to Boniface, and Boniface's possession of Africa is again marked by a word which might suggest doubts as to the full legitimacy of his position *.

We are now landed in a series of events in which Boniface, Castinus, and Aetius all take their share. But with regard to Aetius this time is a more marked epoch than it is with regard to either of the others. Boniface and Castinus have already appeared in Western annals; this is the first time that they mention Aetius. In truth it is now that, at any rate in the West, his strictly historic action begins; we may therefore now put together such an account of his career up to this point as many, though scattered, notices enable us to do. Aetius was the son of Gaudentius †, a chief man in the Roman province of Scythia, the modern Dobrutscha, at the mouth of the Danube. His mother, whose name is not given, was of Italian birth, wealthy, and sprung of a noble stock. The name of their son might point to Greek tastes in one or the other parent; one almost wonders that no one seems to have played on a name so fitted for the chieftain who bore the

* Prosper; "Castino et Victore Coss. Theodosius Valentinianum amitæ suæ filium Cæsarem facit, et cum Augusta matre sua ad recipiendum occidentale mittit imperium, quo tempore Joannes, dum Africam, *quam Bonifacius obtinebat*, bello reposcit, ad defensionem sui infirmior factus est."

† Renatus Frigeridus ap. Greg. Tur. ii. 8; "Gaudentius pater, Scyciæ provintiæ primoris loci . . . mater Itala, nobilis ac locuples fœmina." I suppose that, by putting this notice and that of Jordanis together, we get to the statement in the text. "Itala" can hardly be a proper name.

eagles of the Western Rome to the last and among the greatest of her victories. The son of Gaudentius and his Roman wife was born at Dorostonon on the Danube, the strong town famous in later wars, in one age as Dorystolon, in another as Silistria. Aetius was thus a native of the lands watered by the great Illyrian river, but he was born too far down its course to rank as a countryman of the great Illyrian emperors of an earlier time*. We are able to trace Gaudentius as holding a high command in Africa, and as playing the part of a zealous Christian by helping in the destruction of pagan temples in that province †. And his importance is shown by the way in which his son, in childhood and youth, seems to be specially chosen as a hostage in actions between the emperor and the barbaric powers. He was for three years a hostage with Alaric; at a later time, it would seem, the Gothic king again asked for him in that character, but was refused by Honorius. At another time he was a hostage with the Huns ‡. In these sojourns among strangers, he learned the ways of those among whom he dwelt; he gained a strong personal influence over them; he learned alike how to overcome them

* Jordanis, Get. 34; "Aetius patricius . . . fortissimorum Mœsium stirpe progenitus in Dorostorena civitate a patre Gaudentio, labores bellicos tolerans, rei publicæ Romanæ singulariter natus, qui superbam Suavorum Francorumque [he does not add 'Gothorum'] barbariem immensis cædibus servire Romano imperio coegisset." The name of the place takes endless forms; as Dorystolon it was famous in the tenth century and as Silistria in the nineteenth, in two opposite ways.

† In Cod. Theod. xi. 17, 3, we find "Gaudentius vir clarissimus comes Africæ." When we remember how the father of Paulinus of Pella was moved about, there is nothing wonderful in finding the same man employed in all parts of the world.

Augustine (Civ. Dei, xviii. 54, 1) records the fact, and dates it minutely; "Consule Manlio Theodoro (A.D. 399) . . . in civitate notissima et eminentissima Carthagine Africæ Gaudentius et Jovius comites imperatoris Honorii, quarto decimo Kalendas Aprilis falsorum deorum templa everterunt et simulacra fregerunt." This would surely be too much for one day's work; perhaps the date only marks the beginning.

‡ Renatus ap. Greg. Tur. ii. 8; "Aetius a puero prætorianus, tribus annis Alarici obsessus (al. obses), dehinc Chunorum." In Zôsimos, vi. 36, Alaric asks λαβεῖν ὁμήρους Ἀέτιον καὶ Ἰάσονα, τὸν μὲν Ἰοβίου γενόμενον παῖδα, τὸν δὲ Γαυδεντίου. Honorius refuses. This seems (Tillemont, vi. 180) to come between the two times when he was hostage.

as enemies of the empire and how to make use of them in the internal politics of the empire. He had a wife of whom we hear much, though her name is not recorded, and two sons, Carpilio and Gaudentius, of whom Carpilio was, like his father, a hostage with the Huns *. Gaudentius and his nameless mother connect themselves more directly with the thread of the story. In one account, as Gaudentius is the grandson of an elder Gaudentius, so is Carpilio the grandson of an elder Carpilio. That is, the wife of Aetius was the daughter of Carpilio †. It is hard to reconcile the bit of prose which helps us to this name, which can hardly be the name of a Goth, with the high-flowing verses of two poets in which the wife of Aetius appears as the daughter of Gothic kings and heroes, as grudging that she is herself shut out from her ancestral kingship, and as striving to make up for the loss by raising her son Gaudentius to the rank of a Roman Augustus ‡. It is hard to see the fierce and domineering woman of this picture in another scene where the wife of Aetius is painted as a saintly matron whose prayers have such power with the saints that

* Priscus, 179 ; Cassiod. Var. i. 4.

† Aetius is "Carpilionis gener" in Renatus.

‡ "Schwerlich gehörte des Aëtius Gattin, allerdings eine gothische Fürstentochter, dem Hause des Theoderich an," says Dahn, K. G. v. 74. The elder Carpilio was hardly a Gothic prince ; yet in Merobaudes' poem on the birthday of one of the sons (iv. 15), his daughter is thus brought in ;

> "Adsit cum socio parente conjunx,
> Conjunx non levibus canenda Musis,
> Heroum suboles, propago regum,
> Cujus gloria feminam superstat."

This "livida conjux" of Aetius plays a wonderful part in Sidonius' Panegyric on Majorian (126–274), pouring forth hexameters boiling over with Greek legendary references enough to fill a Classical Dictionary. Her name is not given, but she clearly claims a kingly Gothic descent. The most important passage is 203–6 ;

> "Quid faciam infelix? gnato quæ regna parabo,
> Exclusa sceptris Geticis, respublica si me
> Præterit, et parvus super hoc Gaudentius hujus
> Calcatur fatis?"

Hujus = Majoriani. Gaudentius, called after the grandfather on the father's side, would actually be the elder son. How are we to reconcile the two poets with the prose writer? If a Goth could be called Carpilio, there would be no difficulty.

Heaven can never refuse victory to her husband *. These stories, to one at least of which we shall come again, belong to the later years of the life of Aetius; we are now concerned with his earlier deeds. It is possible that, far away as his birthplace was from both Gaul and Africa, his connexion both with the land which was to be the special scene of his glory and with the land whose destiny he is said to have ruled from a distance began early. We have seen the father of Aetius in Africa; one mention of himself tells us that Gaudentius, count and *magister militum*, was slain, at some time not stated, in a military outbreak in Gaul †. We should have been glad of a date; but the first mention of Aetius in any recorded year sets him before us in quite another quarter, but in one where one might more naturally look for a notice of the Roman Scythia than either in Africa or in Gaul. Born as he was east of Hadria, we first hear of Aetius in his own peninsula as præfect of Constantinople in the consulship of Maximus and Plintha. And he left a name behind him in the Eastern Rome, for two years later the cistern of Aetius was built ‡. A tale is told how the præfect Aetius hardly escaped death from a murderous dagger under circumstances which remind us of some of the bloody scenes of Frankish history in the next century. The story runs that, on one Sunday, as the præfect was going in state to the great church, the old Saint Sophia, an old man named Kyriakos—could the name be suggested by the day?—pretending to present a petition, struck at him with his hidden weapon, but prevailed no further than to rend his official garments, his Roman *toga* and *pænula* §. This Eastern

* See the story in Greg. Tur. ii. 7. Aetius was fated to die, but she wrestled with Saint Peter and overcame fate. One thinks of Apollo and the Moirai on behalf of Crœsus.

† This is in the chronicle known (somewhat strangely) as Prosper Tiro, that which looks so carefully after British affairs. In recording the reign of the tyrant John, it runs; "Aetius, Gaudentii comitis [he is magister equitum in Renatus] a militibus in Galliis occisi filius, cum Chunnis Joanni opem laturus Italiam ingreditur."

‡ Marcellinus, 421; "Cisterna Aetii constructa est." See Codinus, p. 29; Banduri Const. Christ. 80.

§ See Gothofred's Chronology of the Theodosian Code, i. clxv. The

stage of the life of Aetius seems to be overlooked by all modern writers save one or two who somewhat lightly assume that an Aetius at Constantinople must be a different person from the Aetius of Ravenna, Arles, and Rome *. It is hard to see why, in an age when men were moved so freely over all parts of the Roman world, and in the case of a man whose birth and parentage connected him first of all with the East. We know not whether the præfectship of Aetius at Constantinople came before or after his father's murder in Gaul. Four years later we find him in Italy, as a chief supporter and officer of the ruler who had supplanted the Theodosian house in the West.

The action of Aetius at this time comes from the best authorities that we have, and one of them takes the opportunity to paint his portrait at length. The picture is to be found in one of those precious fragments of writers older than his own day which have been preserved to us by Gregory of Auvergne and Tours. Well shaped, of middle height, with a frame, as it is put, neither weak nor burthensome, active in mind, strong in every limb, skilled in every exercise of war, cunning to guide the horse, to use alike the arrow and the javelin, undaunted in danger, bearing up under hunger, thirst, and watching—to Frigeridus at least he seemed no less admirable in peace than in war. For he was moreover one who sought what was just and whom no seducer could beguile from his just purpose; he was free from the lust of gain, and even, according to the teaching of the new creed of Rome, patient under wrong †. So he seemed to Gaulish admirers, who appear

consuls are Monaxius and Plintha. In their consulship the Paschal Chronicle (i. 574) places the attempt on Aetius; *ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν ὑπάτων ἡμέρᾳ κυριακῇ εἰσελθόντος Ἀετίου ἐπάρχου πόλεως μετὰ τοῦ σχήματος ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ μηνὶ περιτίῳ πρὸ ζ' καλάνδων μαρτίων ἐπὶ τῷ εὐξάμενον αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν κληθέντα ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ, Κυριακός τις γέρων βαλὼν μάχαιραν μεγάλην εἰς χάρτην, ὡσανεὶ λίβελλον αὐτῷ προσφέρων, ἔκρουσεν αὐτῷ κατὰ τοῦ δεξιοῦ μέρους τοῦ στήθους, ὥστε τὸ πενόλιον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν τόγαν τρηθῆναι.* One is reminded of the slaying of Cæsar, also of Ritchie Moniplies presenting his "sifflication" to James Sixth and First.

* So Sievers (p. 456) half hints that the præfect of Constantinople was not our Aetius. But why?

† Ren. Frig.; "Medii corporis, virilis habitudinis, decenter formatus,

not to have looked on his conduct at this time as blameworthy. The long and feeble reign of Honorius was drawing to its end, when his last caprice of all, the caprice of hatred following on extravagant fondness, sent away his sister Placidia, now the widow of her Roman and imperial husband, with her son, the *nobilissimus** Valentinian, to seek shelter at Constantinople with her nephew Theodosius. Their absence left the Theodosian house without a representative in Italy. The Western throne was open to any adventurer, and it was seized, not by any military chief, but by the civilian John, chief of the notaries. His accession or election seems to have been peaceful and popular, and our only personal portrait of him, drawn to be sure at a later time, is singularly favourable †. But some charged him with Arianism, and his successful rivals in their legislation represent him as trampling on the privileges of the

quo neque infirmitudini esset neque oneri, animo alacer, membris vegetus, eques prumptissimus, sagittarum jactu peritus, contu impiger, bellis aptissimus, pacis artibus celebris, nullius avaritiæ, minimæ cupiditatis, bonis animi præditus, ne impulsoribus quidem pravis ab instituto suo devians, injuriarum patientissimus, laboris adpetens, inpavidus periculorum, famis, sitis, vigiliarum tolerantissimus. Cui ab ineunte ætate prædictum liquet, quantæ potentiæ fatis destinaretur, temporibus suis locisque celebrandus."

* See Clinton in an. 424. Olympiodôros makes him be created "Nobilissimus" (Νωβελίσσιμος) by Theodosius. Philostorgios (xii. 12) has him already created ἐπιφανέστατος, which must mean the same, by Honorius.

† His panegyrist is no other than Procopius (Bell. Vand. i. 3), who is copied by Souidas ('Ιωάννης); he makes, however, a strange mistake as to the length of his reign as well as in the description of his calling; *οἱ δὲ τῆς ἐν 'Ρώμῃ βασιλέως αὐλῆς τῶν τινα ἐκείνῃ στρατιωτῶν, 'Ιωάννην ὄνομα, βασιλέα αἱροῦνται. ἦν δὲ οὗτος ἀνὴρ πρᾷός τε καὶ ξυνέσεως εὖ ἥκων καὶ ἀρετῆς μεταποιεῖσθαι ἐξεπιστάμενος· πέντε γοῦν ἔτη τὴν τυραννίδα ἔχων μετρίως ἐξηγήσατο, καὶ οὔτε τοῖς διαβάλλουσι τὴν ἀκοὴν ὑπέσχεν οὔτε φόνον ἄδικον εἰργάσατο ἑκών γε εἶναι οὔτε χρημάτων ἀφαιρέσει ἐπέθετο· ἐς δὲ βαρβάρους οὐδὲν ὅτι καὶ πρᾶξαι οἷός τε ἐγεγόνει, ἐπεί οἱ τὰ ἐκ Βυζαντίου πολέμια ἦν.* We shall soon learn to distrust Procopius for times so long before his own day; but his picture of John seems rather to fall in with one or two incidental notices. The election spoken of is more likely to have happened at Ravenna than at Rome; but the curious anecdote preserved by Olympiodôros (468, see Hodgkin, i.) looks as if he was not disliked; *'Ιωάννης τις αὐθεντήσας τυραννεῖ· ἐφ' οὗ καὶ τῆς ἀναρρήσεως γενομένης, ἐρρήθη ὥσπερ ἀπό τινος πορρήσεως προαχθὲν, "πίπτει, οὐ στήκει." καὶ τὸ πλῆθος, ὥσπερ ἀναλύοντες ἐπὶ τὸ ῥηθὲν, ἀναφωνοῦσι, "στήκει, οὐ πίπτει."* What is the exact force of *αὐθεντήσας*?

clergy, much like our Henry II *. He was acknowledged in Italy, Gaul, and Spain; that he was not acknowledged in Africa we have already seen †. Not a soldier himself, he had men of war at his side. His cause was maintained by the *magister militum* Castinus, whom we have heard of as the enemy of Boniface ‡. Aetius was on the same side, Count of the Domestics and holding the civil office of *cura palatii* under the new sovereign of the West. This last was the office which in a later form became *curopalates*, the special guardian of the august dwelling-place and its building §. But between Aetius and Boniface, though they are on opposite sides, there is no sign of any direct hostility. The leader of the enterprise against Boniface in Africa may have been the Goth Sigisvult ‖; it certainly was not Aetius. For he was sent on an errand in quite an opposite direction. Marked out for such a mission by his knowledge of the barbarians and by his influence among

* Cod. Theod. xvi. Tit. ii. 47 (vi. 94); "Privilegia ecclesiarum omnium quæ sæculo nostro tyrannus invaderat, prona devotione revocamus. . . . Clericos etiam quos indiscretim ad sæculares judices debere duci infaustus ille præsumptor dixerat, episcopali audientiæ reservamus." See Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. vi. 184. One thinks of the Constitutions of Clarendon.

† See above, p. 317, note *.

‡ Prosper, 423; "Honorius moritur, et regnum ejus Joannes occupat, connivente, ut putabatur, Castino, qui exercitui magister militum præfuit," and in 425 on the defeat of John, "Castinus in exsilium actus est, quia videbatur Joannem sine conniventia ipsius regnum non potuisse assumere." He had just before, in 422, said that Castinus "Bonifacium virum bellicis artibus præclarum, inepto et injurioso imperio ab expeditionis suæ societate avertit," &c.

§ So Renatus; "Ex comite domesticorum et Johannis cura palatii." See Ducange in Cura. His Formula is given by Cassiodorus, viii. 15. This seems to be the "Castrensis sacri palatii" of the Notitia, i. 4, 47. See Güldenpenning, 281.

‖ Prosper Tiro places here the entry "Sigisvuldus ad Africam contra Bonifacium properavit," as if Sigisvult had been sent on behalf of John. But one cannot help thinking that this is a confusion with his later expedition. I know not whether Migne's edition has any authority for the form given to his name, "Sigisvultdeus," which savours rather of an African, either Catholic or Donatist, than of an Arian Goth. Elsewhere he is Sigisvul*t*us or Sigisvul*d*us. *Wald*, we may suppose, is the true ending.

them, he was sent to bring a Hunnish force to the help of John *.

This is the earliest act that is distinctly recorded in the Western career, in the military career, of the man whose highest renown is to have been the first to check the advance of Attila. It is a strange beginning, but the bringing in of barbarian allies had long been too common to be looked on with any special horror, and Hunnish mercenaries had been often employed before and were often employed after. The story sets Aetius before us as wonderfully skilful in the management of Romans and barbarians alike, but he did little for the prince whose cause he had taken up. Johannes Augustus was premature. So, though less glaringly, was Johannes the Roman consul of the next year. There was a consul John thirty-two years later †: but the first acknowledged imperial bearer of the name of the Baptist and the Evangelist was the Armenian hero of the tenth century, the renowned John Tzimiskês. In the imperial *fasti* of the West no name of that class found a place till the House of Habsburg favoured the world with an august Matthias and two august Josephs. The house of Theodosius, represented by Placidia Augusta and her son, had not lost all hold on the sympathies of the West. The present Theodosius, the ruler of the East, now in loyal eyes sole emperor, sent his aunt and the boy Valentinian, now proclaimed Cæsar, to dislodge the tyrant John by the arms of Ardaburius and his son Aspar ‡. The details of his overthrow do not directly touch the career of Aetius; but we are carried on towards our later narrative when we see Aquileia playing for the last time the part of one of the great cities of the earth. It was in its hippodrome that John paid the cruel forfeit of less than two years' dominion §.

* This is most strongly brought up by Renatus; "Johannes Aetium, id temporis curam palatii, cum ingenti auri pondere ad Chunos transmittit, notus sibi obsidatus sui tempore et familiari amicicia devinctos."

† Johannes and Veranes are consuls in 456.

‡ This story is told by Philostorgios, xii. 13; Sôkratês, vii. 23, 26; Olympiodôros, 471.

§ Philost. xii. 13; Ἰωάννης . . . εἰς Ἀκολήϊαν ἐκπέμπεται, κἀκεῖ τὴν δεξιὰν

Ravenna, which had maintained his cause, became, after a passing sack, the dwelling-place in life and death of the restored Augusta; but it was in Rome itself that the third Valentinian, the seven years' old son of the third Constantius, was proclaimed Augustus by the authority of his Eastern colleague *. Three days after the death of John, Aetius came with 60,000 Huns to his support. A battle took place between the new comers and the forces of Valentinian under the command of Aspar, in which many were slain on both sides. An agreement followed; Aetius entered the service of Placidia and Valentinian with the rank of count. He had influence enough with his barbarian following to persuade them to go back on receiving what, after an analogy in our own history, we may call a *Hungeld* †. Perhaps they also told at home what a city Aquileia would be for some lucky band of Huns to plunder or to destroy.

The sphere of action of Aetius is now at once changed to Gaul. Enlisted in the service of Placidia and Valentinian, he sets forth to establish the dominion of his sovereigns alike against disaffected Romans, of whom we see some signs, against the West-Goth who threatened Arles, and in course of time against perhaps every barbarian enemy or rebel who had made a settlement in Gaul or was striving either to settle

προδιατμηθεὶς, εἶτα καὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀποτέμνεται. Procopius (Bell. Vand. i. 3) adds some details; ζῶντα Οὐαλεντινιανὸς Ἰωάννην λαβὼν ἔν τε τῷ Ἀκυληίας ἱπποδρομίῳ τὴν ἑτέραν ταῖν χεροῖν ἀποκοπέντα εἰσῆγεν ἐπόμπευσέ τε ὄνῳ ὀχούμενον, καὶ πολλὰ παρὰ τῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς ἐνταῦθα παθόντα τε καὶ ἀκούσαντα ἔκτεινεν. The importance of Salona is as marked in the story as that of Aquileia.

* This is told in various ways, but that the admission to the rank of Augustus was at Rome is plain from Olympiodôros. It seems to have been the last fact that he recorded. So Idatius.

† Our best account is Philostorgios, xii. 14; Ἀέτιος ὁ ὑποστρατηγὸς Ἰωάννου τοῦ τυράννου, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας τῆς ἐκείνου τελευτῆς, βαρβάρους ἄγων μισθωτοὺς εἰς ξ' χιλιάδας παραγίνεται· καὶ συμπλοκῆς αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἄσπαρα γεγενημένης, φόνος ἑκατέρωθεν ἐρρύη πολύς· ἔπειτα σπονδὰς ὁ Ἀέτιος τίθεται πρὸς Πλακιδίαν καὶ Οὐαλεντινιανὸν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ κόμητος ἀξίαν λαμβάνει, καὶ οἱ βάρβαροι χρυσίῳ καταθέμενοι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ τὰ ὅπλα, ὁμήρους τε δόντες καὶ τὰ πιστὰ λαβόντες, εἰς τὰ οἰκεῖα ἤθη ἀπεχώρησαν. This is very like a Danegeld. So Prosper; "data venia Aetio, quod Hunni quos per ipsum Joannes acciverat ejusdem studio ad propria reversi sunt."

or to destroy. But this his purely Gaulish and military career will be best dealt with elsewhere; no one has brought that side of him into connexion with his alleged enmity to Boniface or with political intrigues of any kind. Of the undoubted enemies of Boniface one was now set aside from his rank and another was put in his place. Of the two chief supporters of John, Aetius had won the favour of the victorious side; Castinus was less lucky. He was sent into banishment; the reason assigned is that it seemed that John could not have assumed the empire without his consent *. The wording is remarkable; it might imply that the partisanship of Castinus was less open than that of Aetius. If so, the secret plotters fared, and perhaps justly, worse than the avowed enemy who had led the Huns to the attack of the armies of Valentinian. Castinus now vanishes from the story. His office was seemingly bestowed on a certain Felix, whom we hear of as *magister militum* in the next year. To this man's power of mischief justice has clearly not been done, and it looks very much as if some of his actions, especially his dealings with Boniface, had been transferred to Aetius. No process could be more natural in the next age, when Aetius was still a great name, but when Felix was doubtless forgotten. His first recorded act has nothing to do with either Boniface or Aetius. He is charged with the deaths of Patroclus bishop of Arles and of Titus, a holy deacon at Rome, who is said to have been killed by the practice of Felix while he was in the act of giving alms to the poor †. The Roman tale is obscure; the Gaulish one is of some importance in Gaulish history, and as such I hope to speak of it elsewhere. Neither of them throws any light on the general story, but both—even if they were only suspicions—throw some light on the character of Felix. In the next year Felix comes into the very thick of the main story, and we must look back for a moment at the position of Boniface. We have seen that he was perhaps in command in Africa before

* See above, p. 323, note ‡.

† Prosper (426), after the death of Patroclus, adds "cujus [Felicis] impulsu creditus est etiam Titus diaconus vir sanctus Romæ pecunias pauperibus distribuens interemptus."

the expedition of Castinus to Spain in 422, that he certainly was in command there after he had refused to share in that expedition, but whether by a perfectly regular appointment is not quite clear *. We have seen also the way in which Africa under Boniface held out against John. Still we cannot quite forget either the way in which his position in Africa has already been spoken of, or the fact, to which we shall come presently, that the next time we hear of him he is in distinct, perhaps armed, opposition to the emperor's orders. Meanwhile he had gone on for a season winning great glory by his administration of his province, and his successful defence of it against native African marauders. The words of his correspondent Saint Augustine here come happily in to explain the vaguer entries of the annalist, and to make us understand their connexion with the entry that follows. In the annals Boniface does great exploits and wins great glory, and is presently dealt with as a rebel †. The words of Augustine ‡ give us the

* See above, p. 315, note ‡.

† Prosper, 427; "Hierio et Ardabure coss. Bonifacio, cujus potentia gloriaque intra Africam augebatur, bellum ad arbitrium Felicis, quia ad Italiam venire abnuerat, publico nomine illatum est." Prosper here seems to speak admiringly of Boniface; yet we must remember his earlier language about "invadit" and "obtinebat"; it is even possible that the word "potentia" looks the same way. At any rate the increasing power and glory of a subject were in those days an unavoidable object of jealousy to the prince. Anyhow it is droll when Güldenpenning (280) extols Bonifacius as the ever-loyal adherent of Placidia through all difficulties. This writer, like the good old Tillemont, does not shirk the annalists, but tries to believe them and the legend too.

‡ Aug. ep. 220 (or 70), ad Bon. (Op. ii. 814, ed. Bened.); "Quid autem dicam de vastatione Africæ, quam faciunt Afri barbari resistente nullo, dum tu talibus tuis necessitatibus occuparis, nec aliquid ordinas unde ista calamitas avertatur? Quis autem crederet, quis timeret, Bonifacio domesticorum et Africæ comite in Africa constituto cum tam magno exercitu et potestate . . . nunc tantum fuisse barbaros ausuros, tantum progressuros, tanta vastaturos, tanta rapturos, tanta loca quæ plena populis fuerant deserta facturos? Qui non dicebant quandocumque tu comitivam sumeres potestatem, Afros barbaros, non solum domitos, sed etiam tributarios futuros Romanæ reipublicæ? Et nunc quam in contraria versa sit spes hominum vides, nec diutius hinc tecum loquendum, quia plus ea tu potes cogitare quam nos dicere." It is not easy to see when Boniface was invested with the rank of count. Augustine's words

key: we see that, if Boniface had gained great glory, he had deservedly lost it, and had become an object of reasonable suspicion at court. From the same source we learn his exact official rank at this time; he was Count of the Domestics and count of Africa. But the count, at any rate at the time of Augustine's letter, was less active than the tribune had been in times past. At the time of his appointment all men had hoped that under his government Africa would again become a peaceful Roman land, with its native tribes again subjects and tributaries of the empire. Now all this had changed; the barbarians took heart; they advanced, they laid waste lands which they had never before touched. The discourse is wholly about native Africans. There is not a word which can have any possible reference to the Vandals; it was clearly written before the coming of the Vandals was thought of. The whole correspondence between the saint and the count is of deep personal and ecclesiastical interest. Boniface is set before us as a dear friend of Augustine, as at one time a man of scrupulous life and religious zeal, full of interest in theological subjects, on which he poses his illustrious friend with hard questions. But he had fallen away from his personal as well as from his official duties. By a story exactly the reverse of that of our own Simon, he had vowed chastity after the death of his wife, but he was now not only married again to a rich lady named Pelagia, but he had allowed his child to receive Arian baptism, and he was further suspected of living with

might almost imply that all his brilliant exploits had been done when he held no higher rank than that of tribune, and that he had failed in his duty ever since his promotion. We might also suppose that he had not been count very long when the letter was written. Now the letter must be earlier than 428, the year of the coming of the Vandals. It is most naturally fixed to 427, the time of the action of Felix against Boniface. If Boniface in that year was count, but had not been count very long, the most natural time for his appointment would be in 425, as the reward of his defence of Africa against John. This might fall in with the several hints which suggest that there was something irregular about his position in Africa at an earlier time. We may suppose that, whatever it was before, it was legalized now, but that, as Augustine implies, the count fell away from the merits of the tribune and thereby brought on himself the imperial censure which is implied in the events of 427.

mistresses. So busy was he with his own affairs that he had allowed Africa to be overrun by Africans. For all these faults both as a Christian man and as a Roman commander, the saint sternly rebukes him and gives him good advice in both characters. But he assuredly in no way reproves him for treasonable dealings with Gaiseric, which, if they ever happened at all, certainly had not happened then *.

There are one or two other points in the letter that may be noticed. Boniface had been, at some stage or other, anxious to retire from the world, and to give himself wholly to religious duties. He married his second wife in some country which was reached from Africa by sea, and the voyage was one which he undertook by imperial bidding †. This and the fact that the lady seems to have been an Arian might seem to point to Spain. But it is most unlikely that a woman bearing the name of Pelagia should have been of Vandal birth. Boniface may have been sent to Spain on many unrecorded errands. What we cannot do is to connect such a voyage with that expedition of Castinus when Boniface did not go to Spain. Again Augustine, when rebuking Boniface for his neglect of his military duties, makes Boniface answer that the fault is not with him, but with those who had wronged him and made him an evil return for his good service ‡. This doubtless points to the enmity of Castinus and Felix. It might even suggest that the letter was written at the very time of the expedition sent by Felix against Boniface, a time not likely

* See the earlier letter of Augustine to Boniface, No. 185 or 50. In the very weak article on Boniface in the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography by a late popular writer, all this about the Africans is turned into "bitter reproaches" for the supposed dealings with Gaiseric. In the Dictionary of Christian Biography no lay Boniface is allowed; the article on Augustine does not contain the name of Boniface, but it does contain the astounding statement that Augustine died "when the armies of the *Huns* surrounded the city of Hippo."

† All this comes out in letter 220. The most important passage is; "Navigasti, uxoremque duxisti, sed navigasse obedientiæ fuit quam secundum apostolum debebas sublimioribus potestatibus" (ii. 813).

‡ Ep. 220; "Sed forte ad ea respondes illis hoc esse potius imputandum qui te læserunt, qui tuis officiosis virtutibus non paria sed contraria reddiderunt."

to be marked by vigorous action against the native barbarians. But if Boniface had been in open rebellion at the time of the sending of the letter, surely Augustine would have made some reference to that fact. It is far more likely that the letter comes earlier, and that in the state of things which it describes we see the explanation of what we read in the chronicles. We see Boniface, from whatever cause, falling aside from his former excellence, ghostly and worldly, and above all, what concerned the empire more than his irregular marriage, grossly neglecting his duty as a Roman military commander in the province of Africa. There is no direct mention of Castinus and Felix in the acknowledged letters of Augustine; but there is a remarkable collection of short letters, purporting to be exchanged between the bishop and the count, which have been unanimously cast aside by Augustine's editors and commentators. They are rejected, partly as inconsistent with the saint's style and manner, but partly also as inconsistent with the history of the time. On the former charge the condemnation seems to rest on good grounds*. There is an abruptness, a jerkiness in truth, about the letters which is not in the manner of Augustine; their very shortness, when the subject supplied such an opportunity for moralizing, is against them. Some of the expressions used are hardly in character, and it has even been suggested that some of the expressions used are designed to advance certain ecclesiastical theories. On the whole, we cannot accept the letters as genuine writings of Augustine and Boniface. Still they are not without value. The objection to them on historical grounds merely comes to this, that whoever forged them followed the authentic story of the annalists, and not the Procopian legend. He may even have lived at the time and have written from his own knowledge. If so, his witness is, like that of many a false charter, good on all points save the one which he is trying to establish. Even if we place him later, he at any rate made up his story from trustworthy sources or from traditions consistent with

* I have to thank Dr. Bright, who knows the writings of Augustine far better than I do, for some most valuable hints on this side of the question.

them, and he is the only writer who has done so. The invasion of Africa by the imperial troops sent against Boniface is strongly brought out*. Felix is not mentioned by name, but he is clearly alluded to†, and the name of Castinus comes in more than once. If we trust the letters, he sought shelter in Africa when he was banished from Italy in 425‡. The shelter may seem a strange one for the old enemy of Boniface, but we must again remember the very doubtful position of Boniface in Africa. He had defended that province against John; but his earlier and later relations to Honorius and Placidia are such as to make it possible that the fallen *magister militum* might expect that his own offences towards Boniface might be thought less of than those of the imperial government.

In any case we have the undoubted fact that, only two years after the fall of John, Boniface was looked on at Ravenna as an enemy of the empire. What was his offence? It is easy to talk about the intrigues of Aetius or of anybody

* In Appendix, ep. 4 (or 185), Augustine is made to say, with a clear reference to the Arian Sigisvult; "Africæ litus, ut audio, miles attigit transmarinus, sed hujus militis dux a catholica veritate dissentit. Quid orem sicut oportet ignoro. Ab Italia hostis est publicus nuntiatus, contra victricia signa superbas erigens hastas. Pacem inter vos fieri vellem si scirem plenius quod ignoro. Adest quidem Africæ olim paratum in Italia bellum, sed tamen non invideo, fili carissime, Romaniæ. Sed dico quod sentio. Non dabit, divinitate juvante, catholicus hæretico terga. Tui cordis intentio dirigatur ad Deum, non militem timebis, non Gothum non Hunum."

† Boniface, in answer (5 or 186), talks about "quæ adversus me tyrannus ille ordinaverit ac disponat," all in a style of high orthodoxy.

‡ App. 10 (or 191); "Castinus ille privatus ex consule vitæ meæ ac nominis, omnibus ut notum est, persecutor, pejores committens ac fingens factiones, quasi mearum a me gestarum immemor, donationum (another reading is 'Edatium'), Italia fugiens, meis se in Africa defensionibus tradidit committendum." Augustine (11 or 192) answers, "Vir illustrissimus Castinus sacramento se prodidit quod sit ab omni culpa et erroribus alienus. Quem tibi, ut dicit, fœderatus ille Sonia, adhuc te in palatio posito, falsis suggestionibus concitabat." All this looks as if it referred to an earlier time, to the banishment of Castinus in 425. And who is "Edatius"?—Aetius? or who? But there is enough of likeness to the true story to suggest that there is, after all, something in these letters, and that the stories about Gudila—a name hardly likely to have been invented—may be worth examining.

else, but once put the Procopian legend out of sight and the matter seems very plain. Boniface, as his saintly friend witnesses, had grossly neglected his duty, and he was called on to account for it. After Augustine's letter it is really nothing wonderful if we read in the annals that Boniface was summoned to Italy—that is, to Ravenna; and that when he refused to come, he was declared a public enemy. But the minister who directed this course, whether wise or foolish, was not Aetius but Felix *. Of Aetius just at this moment there is no mention at all; a little while before and a little while after he is carrying on his great career in Gaul †. It is to be noted that at this point the tone of the Aquitanian chronicler betrays perhaps a feeling of sympathy with Boniface, certainly a feeling against Felix, which would be natural enough after even the suspicion of the deaths of Patroclus and Titus. But though Felix may have been a bad and even a bloody minister, his first action against Boniface was assuredly not taken without reason. The count of Africa lets his province be harried by barbarians without resistance; he is summoned to Ravenna to explain his conduct; refusing to come, he is declared an enemy of the republic. All this is plain enough; there is no mention of any action of Aetius; there is no mention, nor as yet any hint, of any dealings between Boniface and Gaiseric. What we have as yet is a war carried on by the Roman government against a Roman rebel. Three commanders are sent against Boniface; one perhaps would have done the work better, as the three disagreed. Two of them, Mavortius and Galbio, besiege Boniface in some place not named. Their

* Prosper, 427; "Hierio et Ardabure coss. Bonifacio, cujus potentia gloriaque intra Africam augebatur, bellum ad arbitrium Felicis, quia ad Italiam venire abnuerat, publico nomine illatum est, ducibus Mavortio et Galbione et Sinoce." Güldenpenning (283) knows the workings of the mind of Aetius as minutely as Augustine knew those of Boniface; "Aetius aber, um nicht dem Argwohn in der Brust der Placidia neue Nahrung zu gewähren, liess sich nicht selbst gegen seinen Nebenbuhler entsenden, sondern sein Parteigenosse, der magister militum Felix, beauftragte den Mavortius, Galbio und Sinox mit der Führung der römischen Truppen gegen den 'Reichsfeind' Bonifacius."

† See Prosper 425 for his Gothic, and 428 for his Frankish victories.

colleague Sinox enters into a treasonable correspondence with Boniface, and by his arts the two loyal commanders are killed. Then Boniface discovers Sinox in some plot against himself, and puts him to death also. Another commander, with the distinctly barbarian name of Sigisvult, a man who has already flitted before us as a shadow, is sent to carry on the war with Boniface instead of the three who have all perished.

All this follows naturally enough: it rests on good authority; we should simply be glad of fuller details. But between the death of Sinox and the appointment of Sigisvult, we come to an entry of the very darkest, made dark, we may be sure, of set purpose *. While the strife was going on, the disputants, both sides it would seem, asked for the help of certain people who had no knowledge of ships, but to whom the sea was laid open by their invitation. Then comes the appointment of Sigisvult, and then an entry in which our sainted chronicler leaves off speaking in proverbs and tells us plainly that the people of the Vandals crossed from Spain into Africa. That event is perhaps put a little too early; but its exact date and its exact details do not concern us. Gaiseric may have been planning such an enterprise long before; it is here implied—for the Vandals of the clear entry are surely the unnamed people of the dark one—that the immediate occasion of the migration was the application for help from some or other of the Roman commanders in the civil war decreed by Felix against Boniface. The words rather imply that application was made from at least two opposing quarters. Neither Mavortius, Galbio, Sinox, nor Boniface is personally named. Suspicion is very strong against Boniface, but he may not have applied to Gaiseric till his enemies had already done so; he certainly did not do so till civil war was actually waging

* Prosper, 427; "[Sinox] cujus proditione Mavortius et Galbio, cum Bonifacium obsiderent, interempti sunt, moxque ipse a Bonifacio dolo detectus, occisus est. Exinde gentibus, quæ navibus uti nesciebant, dum a concertantibus in auxilium vocantur, mare pervium factum est, bellique contra Bonifacium cœpti in Sigisvultum comitem cura translata est. Gens Vandalorum ab Hispania ad Africam transit." Idatius places the coming of the Vandals in 429, and says nothing about Boniface.

against himself. If he ever thought of making himself tyrant by Vandal help, it was truly a great fall for the saintly hero described to us at an earlier time; but it was no more than many other Roman governors had done before him.

The notice in Prosper is really the nearest approach which can be found in any contemporary writer to a charge against Boniface of inviting the Vandals into Africa. And Prosper does not go beyond a dark allusion, in which Boniface is not distinctly named. From this we may leap to the account in Jordanis, who three times attributes the coming of the Vandals to the treason of Boniface. Nothing is said of Aetius. Boniface, being under the displeasure of Valentinian, sees no help for himself except in calling in Gaiseric *. In these hurried references there is nothing that at all contradicts the story in Prosper; Jordanis perhaps hardly understood that the displeasure of Valentinian had come to an actual war, and among the disputants darkly hinted at in the annals, he or those whom he followed naturally preserved the best known name †. We now come to the received story in all its detail, with the elaborate action of Aetius against Boniface. This is found only in the introductory matter with which Procopius brings in the Vandal war. In his narrative Placidia gives Boniface the supreme command in Africa. Aetius is displeased, but hides his displeasure ‡. When Boniface is away in his government, he tells Placidia that the count of Africa is aiming at tyranny, that he seeks to deprive Valentinian of the province;

* Getica, 167, 168, cap. xxxiii.; "Gyzericus rex Vandalorum jam a Bonifatio in Africam invitatus, qui Valentiniano principi veniens in offensam non aliter se quam malo reipublicæ potuit vindicare."

† The entry in the Chronicle of Cassiodorus should here be told (Roncalli, ii. 228); "Hierius et Ardabures. His coss. Bonifacio Africam tenenti infaustè bellum ingeritur. Gens Wandalorum a Gothis exclusa, de Hispaniis ad Africam transit." Cassiodorus seems to have had Prosper before him; but Jordanis can hardly have had the Chronicles of Cassiodorus before him just then, whatever we say of the Gothic History.

‡ Bell. Vand. i. 3, p. 322. (The passage immediately follows the description of Boniface and Aetius quoted above.) *τούτοιν τὸν ἕτερον Βονιφάτιον ἡ Πλακιδία στρατηγὸν ἀπέδειξε Λιβύης ἁπάσης· τοῦτο δὲ οὐ Βουλομένῳ ἦν Ἀετίῳ, ἀλλ' ἥκιστά γε ὡς αὐτὸν οὐκ ἀρέσκει ἐξήνεγκεν· οὔπω γὰρ αὐτοῖν ἡ ἔχθρα ἐς φῶς ἐληλύθει, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῷ προσωπείῳ ἑκατέρῳ ἐκρύπτετο.*

that she may judge of the truth of his charge by this sign. Let her summon Boniface to *Rome*, and he will not come *. At the same time he writes a letter to Boniface, telling him that the emperor's mother is plotting against his life, and that the sign of her plots is this; she will recall him without cause †. Boniface receives the letter summoning him to the emperor's presence; he refuses to go, but does not reveal the warning of Aetius. Placidia on this bestows her fullest confidence on Aetius, and debates what course to follow with regard to Boniface ‡. Boniface meanwhile, feeling that he is not strong enough to withstand the emperor and that to go to Rome would be his destruction §, turns his thoughts to the Vandals and invites Gaiseric into Africa, an invitation which the Vandal accepts and enters the province. Meanwhile the friends of Boniface at Rome are amazed that he of all men should turn tyrant ‖; from not a few earlier examples they might infer that the invitation of barbarians and the taking up of the tyranny naturally went together. Some of them, at Placidia's bidding, go to Carthage; they see Boniface; he shows them the letters of Aetius; they go back to Rome and report to Placidia. Her fear of the power of Aetius hinders her from taking any action against him, or even giving him any rebuke ¶; but she tells the story to the friends of Boniface, and prays and adjures them to win him back to his duty; let

* Bell. Vand. i. 3, p. 322; *διέβαλλεν . . . ὡς τυραννοίη, ἀποστερήσας αὐτήν τε καὶ βασιλέα Λιβύης ἁπάσης, κ. τ. λ. Felix* must have said something very like this to Placidia.

† Ib.; *ἔγραψε πρὸς Βονιφάτιον λάθρα ὡς ἐπιβουλεύοι αὐτῷ ἡ βασιλέως μήτηρ καὶ βούλοιτο αὐτὸν ἐκποδὼν ποιήσασθαι, κ. τ. λ.* Somebody, not necessarily Felix, may have written this to Boniface in sober earnest.

‡ Ib.

§ Ib.; *καὶ γάρ οἱ οὔτε βασιλεῖ ἐδόκει ἀντιτάξασθαι οἵῳ τε εἶναι, ἐς Ῥώμην τε ἀπιόντι οὐδεμία σωτηρία ἐφαίνετο.*

‖ Ib. p. 324; *τοῦ τε τρόπου ἐνθυμούμενοι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐκλογιζόμενοί τε ἡλίκος ὁ παράλογος ἦν, ἐν θαύματι μεγάλῳ ἐποιοῦντο, εἰ Βονιφάτιος τυραννοίη.*

¶ Ib.; *καταπλαγεῖσα ἡ γυνὴ Ἀέτιον μὲν οὐδὲν εἰργάσατο ἄχαρι, οὐδέ τι ὠνείδισεν ὧν αὐτῷ ἐς τὸν βασιλέως οἶκον ἐπέπρακτο, ἐπεὶ αὐτός τε δυνάμει μεγάλῃ ἐχρῆτο καὶ τὰ τῆς βασιλείας πράγματα πονηρὰ ἤδη ἦν.* Here we have the contemporary fact that at this stage there was no open quarrel between Placidia and Aetius, with the explanation of a later time that their seeming good understanding was only because of Placidia's fears.

him not endure that the dominion of the Romans should pass to barbarians. They again go to Africa and tell him all; he repents of his alliance with Gaiseric, and strives in vain with great promises to persuade him to go back *. The Vandal, deeming himself mocked †, defeats the army under Boniface and besieges him in Hippo. Strengthened by a reinforcement from Constantinople under Aspar, he holds out till the Vandals raise the siege ‡. Then Aspar goes back, Boniface goes to Placidia, explains his case, and is received to favour §. Of the later fate of Boniface Procopius has nothing to say; he mentions him once again, but only to tell of a prophecy current before among the boys of Carthage. "G should drive out B and then B should drive out G." So did Gaiseric drive out Boniface and Belisarius drive out Gelimer ‖.

It is easy to point out the many difficulties and inconsistencies of this story. First of all, to look at the matter from the most general point of view, all tales of secret intrigue carry a certain suspicion about them, a suspicion which becomes yet greater when we hear of them for the first time in writers long after the event. We do not reject them because they are unlikely, but rather because they are so likely that they are sure to be reported, whether they happened or not. Or rather we do not strictly reject them, unless there is some distinct evidence against them; we rather put them aside as unproved, as things which very well may have happened, but of which we cannot venture to say that they did happen. But here I think we have distinct evidence against the story. The informant from whom Procopius got the tale had clearly not taken in the state of things at the time. He looked on Boniface as an undoubtedly loyal governor in Africa; he looked

* Bell. Vand. i. 3, p. 324; *τῆς τε πράξεως αὐτῷ καὶ τῆς ἐς τοὺς βαρβάρους ὁμολογίας μετέμελε καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐλιπάρει μύρια πάντα ὑποσχόμενος ἀπὸ Λιβύης ἀνίστασθαι.*

† Ib.; *τῶν δὲ οὐκ ἐνδεχομένων τοὺς λόγους, ἀλλὰ περιυβρίζεσθαι οἰομένων, ἐς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἐλθεῖν ἠναγκάσθη.*

‡ Ib. p. 325.

§ Ib.; *τὴν ὑποψίαν διέλυεν, ὡς οὐκ ἀληθοῦς αἰτίας ἐς αὐτὸν γένοιτο.*

‖ Ib. i. 21, p. 397; *ὡς τὸ γάμμα διώξει τὸ βῆτα καὶ πάλιν αὐτὸ τὸ βῆτα διώξει τὸ γάμμα.*

on Aetius as the minister of Placidia, living in Italy and at Rome. This last mark is curious indeed. When Procopius wrote the Vandal War, he had not had occasion to hear and think so much about Ravenna as he came to do before he wrote the Gothic War. He took Rome for granted as the imperial dwelling-place; if he found it so assumed in the narrative that he followed, it did not occur to him as any difficulty. A little later, after his mother's death, Valentinian was more at Rome than any emperor had been for a good while; but during the administration of Placidia we may always assume the imperial court to be at Ravenna unless proof can be shown that it was somewhere else. So again we cannot positively deny that Aetius may have been at this moment in Italy; all that we can say is that there is nothing to show that he was in Italy and everything to make us think that he was in Gaul. Gaul was now his regular sphere of action. He has lately smitten the Goths on the Rhone; he has before long to smite the Franks on the Rhine. The resident minister of Placidia at Ravenna was Felix. Aetius could, as we shall presently see, come to Italy on occasion; but he was certainly not there habitually, and any tale which places him in Italy, and that not at Ravenna but at Rome, needs some special confirmation. And no such confirmation is to be had, but rather the contrary. The informant of Procopius had no idea of the real circumstances under which Boniface was summoned to Italy, circumstances which we learn from the letter of Augustine. He had no idea of the events which followed the summons, of the war declared against Boniface in the name of the empire and at the instigation of Felix. He leaves this out, and goes on at once to the story of the Vandals. He had no notion by whose influence all that happened was brought about; he does not mention Felix at all; so far as he preserves any shadow of the real story, he puts Aetius instead of Felix. To me it is plain that the whole story in Procopius grew out of a dim memory of the real later enmity—of which Procopius says nothing—between Aetius and Boniface, mixed up with a dim memory of the action of Felix towards Boniface now. The growth of

the story is easy. Somebody acted in an unfriendly way to Boniface in 427; Aetius and Boniface were enemies in 432. Therefore the enmity of Aetius is carried back to the earlier date; the name of the real enemy of that date gives way to Aetius' far more famous name; a story grows up in which the real circumstances of the time are forgotten, and legendary details suiting the supposed circumstances are fitted on. In this shape the tale is told to a statesman and soldier of the next age. He inserts the legend in his history. The true story still abides in the dry entries of a chronicler, which, fully to be understood, needed to be compared with writings with which men were familiar enough for purposes of pious edification, but to which they were not in the habit of turning for points of historical criticism. No wonder then that the legend lived on instead of the truth. Prosper, even with Augustine as his commentator, could not stand against Procopius.

And now what is the real story about Boniface and Gaiseric? What was Boniface doing at the time of the Vandal invasion of Africa? We have seen the story in Procopius. Boniface invites Gaiseric; he repents; he wars with the Vandals; he is besieged in Hippo; he goes to Placidia and explains himself. In all this there is nothing that contradicts the account in the annals. It simply puts it out of sight. Somebody as we have seen, most likely more than one person, did invite Gaiseric, and Boniface is very likely to have been one of them. The battles are likely enough; a Vandal siege of Hippo in which Boniface defended the city is witnessed by the best possible evidence, by that of Possidius the biographer of Augustine, who was actually within the besieged town*. What we complain of is that in the received story we hear only of

* Possidius, Vit. Aug. 28, after describing the vast host "hostium Vandalorum et Alanorum commixtam secum habens Gothorum gentem, aliarumque diversarum personas ex Hispaniæ partibus transmarinis," tells how they besieged Hippo when "in ejus fuerit defensione constitutus *comes quondam Bonifacius* Gothorum fœderatorum exercitui." Possidius was in Hippo with several other bishops. The words in italic look rather as if Boniface, deprived of office, acted as a volunteer against the Vandals.

Gaiseric and nothing of Sigisvult. Yet Sigisvult was certainly doing something in Africa, something at Hippo. We have the witness of Augustine himself for that. Sigisvult, clearly a Goth—therefore doubtless an Arian—took with him an Arian bishop, Maximin by name, with whom the saint had long theological disputations, which are extant among his works. Augustine and Maximin met at Hippo in a time of war. The Arian professed that he had not come to Hippo to dispute with the Catholic, but that he was sent by Count Sigisvult to make peace *. Peace between whom? Obviously between Sigisvult and Boniface, against whom Sigisvult was sent to make war. It would be a forced construction indeed to make it in any way refer to Gaiseric. So again, in the forged letters, there are several references to an heretical enemy coming from Italy, who can be no other than Sigisvult. Against him Boniface wages war, and Augustine is even made to congratulate him on a victory †. If this is not true history, it is most distinctly well imagined. The most natural explanation of all this is that the events referred to in the letters of Augustine, both acknowledged and doubtful, belong to the year 427, the year of the expedition of Sigisvult, or at any rate to a time before the coming of Gaiseric, which is best fixed to 429 ‡. The unlucky thing is that we know nothing of the issue of the expedition of Sigisvult, and it is hard to avoid the conjecture that, as it so utterly passed out of mind, some of its events got mixed up with the story of the coming and settle-

* Augustine has a long Collatio cum Maximino (vol. viii. 649 of the Benedictine edition). It begins, "Cum Augustinus et Maximinus Hippone Regio unum in locum convenissent, . . . Maximinus dixit, Ego non ob istam causam in hanc civitatem adveni ut altercationem proferam cum religione tua, sed missus a comite Sigisvulto contemplatione pacis adveni." For "Sigisvulto" the older edition has "regis multa." See Tillemont, Mém. Eccl. xiii. 1041. Again in Augustine, Sermo cxl. (vol. v. 680 B), we read, "Contra quoddam dictum Maximini Arianorum episcopi, qui cum Sigisvulto comite constitutus in Africa blasphemabat." So Possidius (17) speaks of him as "Arianorum episcopus Maximinus cum Gothis ad Africam veniens."

† See above, p. 331, note *, and the letters 14 (195), 15 (196).

‡ See above, p. 327, note †.

ment of Gaiseric. Almost at the same moment Africa undergoes two invasions, and Boniface acts against two invaders. To be sure, one invader was a Roman officer sent against a rebellious governor, the other was a barbarian king tearing away a province from the empire. Still both were barbarians, both were heretics; they fought, perhaps actually at the same time, in the same land, against the same enemy. It was easy to forget the difference between the position of Sigisvult the Goth and that of Gaiseric the Vandal, and to merge the doings of the less known man in those of the more famous. It may well be that, as the excellent Tillemont suggests, peace was made between Boniface and the government of Ravenna by a certain Count Darius, another of the correspondents of Augustine, who was certainly sent into Africa about this time to make peace between some disputants or other *. If so, Boniface must have been restored to favour at the latest in 430, the year of Augustine's death †, and that most likely as the reward of his services, perhaps volunteered at Hippo. Of the later career of Sigisvult we know only that he must have kept a high reputation in some quarter or other. For ten years later he was consul, consul in company with Aetius ‡. Aetius was then in the midst of Gaulish warfare, and this, his second appointment, came surely from Ravenna and not from Constantinople. This might imply that Sigisvult was in favour in the East as well as in the West. It is unlucky that we hear so little of him; but we may safely set down the *Collatio* between Augustine and Maximin to the year of his action in Africa, probably before the Vandal invasion had begun. And we may fix the acknowledged letter of Augustine to Boniface as belonging to a time earlier still, when their coming was not expected, to a time, one is inclined to think, before the disobedience of Boniface to the summons of Placidia. The dangers of which the letter speaks are neither from the Vandals nor from the imperial army, but from native Africans. As to the possible relations between Boniface and Gaiseric Augustine

* See ep. 229 (or 262), 231 (or 264). The saint's correspondent is "Darius comes, qui pacis conficiendæ causa missus est."

† Prosper in anno. ‡ See Prosper in 436, 437, 438.

tells us nothing. Those relations are so prominent in the version of Procopius, and in all the versions that have been copied from his, that it is hard to keep them out of our heads. But we must remember that there is no direct reference to them in any contemporary writer; there is only the very dark hint in Prosper. The story has been oddly turned about. The possible, but not more than possible, tale of Boniface inviting Gaiseric into Africa has taken a permanent place in history; the undoubted fact that he disobeyed the orders of the empress and was therefore proclaimed a public enemy has altogether passed out of memory.

One part of the story in Procopius may be accepted without doubt, namely the coming of Aspar with the troops from Constantinople. Of Aspar we have heard already as one of the commanders sent to displace John from the Western throne; in later times he had the disposal of the Eastern throne, and his African campaign was made memorable by the story of the omen which foretold the future greatness of Marcian *. It is only against Gaiseric that Aspar can possibly have been sent. So again, the statement of Procopius that Boniface went to Placidia and explained matters to her satisfaction is doubtless his version of the event of 432, when we do at last see Boniface in Italy, restored to the favour of Placidia, and really acting as the enemy of Aetius. But between the expedition sent to chastise the rebel Boniface in Africa and the appearance of Boniface himself as a high imperial officer in Italy, five years passed, five years of no small moment in the life of Aetius.

In 428 came his great Frankish campaign, and we are not surprised to hear of his being raised the next year to a higher military rank. In the consulship of Florentius and Dionysius, Felix is exalted to the dignity of patrician, and Aetius takes his place as *magister militum* †. This is plain enough; the entries of the next year are very puzzling. Our Spanish bishop records a number of exploits of Aetius in this and in the next

* Bell. Vand. i. 4, p. 326.

† Prosper; "Florentio et Dionysio coss. (429). Felice ad patriciam dignitatem provecto, Aetius magister militum factus est."

year, and for the next year he is the best possible witness, as he himself had personal dealings with Aetius. Between Aetius's exploits of 429 and 430 he tells us that Felix was killed at Ravenna in a military outbreak *. Here is certainly nothing to suggest that Aetius had anything to do with this disturbance; the entry of the death of Felix breaks in on an otherwise continuous narrative of events in Gaul and Spain in which Aetius is the grand figure; we might have been tempted to think that it was meant to be specially marked as an event connected in time but no otherwise. Our Aquitanian guide tells us another story. He records the exploits of Aetius in 429; in 430 he mentions him only for the startling announcement that in that year Aetius put to death Felix and his wife Padusia and the deacon Grunnitus, because he found them to be plotting against him †. This entry, when compared with that of Idatius, seems more contradictory than any formal contradiction. Formal contradiction there certainly is none. Aetius may have found time for a hurried journey to Ravenna on this special errand, even at a time when he was, just before and just after, so busy in other parts of the world. This is quite another thing from representing him, as the legend in Procopius does, as the habitual adviser of Placidia at Ravenna or at Rome. Or, though such a reading would be a little forced, the *magister militum* may have found means to stir up the troops at Ravenna to the slaughter of Felix, even though he was himself elsewhere. In any case, the entry in Prosper, distinct and detailed as it is, is of very high authority. We might almost apply the rule, *Credo quia impossibile.* It is far more likely that Idatius should have left out the name of Aetius, either purposely or accidentally, than that Prosper should have put it in where it had absolutely no place. But

* Idatius, VI. Valentiniani; "Felix qui dicebatur patricius Ravennæ tumultu occiditur militari."

† Prosper; "Theodosio XIII et Valentiniano III coss. (430). Aetius Felicem cum uxore sua Padusia et Grunnitum diaconum, cum eos insidiari sibi præsensisset, interemit." Güldenpenning (p. 306) again sees very deep into the heart of Aetius. Padusia has been thought to be the Σπάδουσα of Olympiodôros, p. 467.

we shall do well to stop and think carefully how much the two entries taken together really prove. The entry in Prosper clearly proves that Aetius was at least very generally charged with the deaths of Felix, Padusia, and Grunnitus. Were it not for the entry in Idatius, we should have said that it proved much more than this. The words of Prosper would certainly not have suggested an outbreak of the soldiers. They would most naturally be taken of private murder; they are perhaps not quite incompatible with a public execution, military or civil. But they do not distinctly contradict the story of the military sedition, which Idatius distinctly asserts. We must therefore accept the statement that Felix, and therefore most likely his wife and the deacon, were killed in the outbreak of the soldiers. But we can hardly suppose that the *magister militum* openly gave the word of command for the slaughter of the patrician. Such an act would be perfectly possible, as in the case where Honorius publicly gave thanks for the slaughter of Allobich. But in such a case the word used would hardly be *tumultus*. We are driven to suppose that the action of Aetius was in any case underhand, that he found means to stir up the soldiers to the bloody work, without actually ordering it in his official character. But this brings the story very near to one of those stories of secret intrigue which are always open to suspicion. Felix is said to have been plotting against Aetius; Aetius is said to have caused his death in order to escape from his plots. Both sayings may have been true; Prosper seems to accept the intrigues of Felix as well as the precautionary revenge of Aetius. But we cannot be so certain about either as we may be about things that are recorded to have been done in broad daylight.

Our knowledge then seems to come to this. The patrician Felix was killed in a tumult of the soldiers. And there was at least a general belief that the tumult was the work of the *magister militum* Aetius, and a further belief that this action of the *magister militum* was caused by the discovery (or suspicion) of plots on the part of the patrician against himself. And we must remember that it is the entry in Idatius which leads us to put things in this qualified way; Prosper alone would have

led us to charge Aetius with the death of Felix far more boldly. Of the relations between Aetius and Felix we have up to this time had no direct mention. Felix has been the home adviser of the government of Placidia; Aetius has been its defender against foreign enemies. On the promotion of Felix to a higher rank, Aetius succeeds to the vacant office. There is nothing in this to suggest enmity. But we know not what grudges or jealousies there may have been, and we know from the stories of the bishop of Arles and the deacon Titus that Felix was at least believed to be capable of bringing about men's deaths by secret means. There is nothing unlikely in the story of his plots against Aetius or of the action by which Aetius stopped them. Only we have no statement of details, causes, or results; and the one thing that gets beyond mere likelihood is the slaughter of Felix by the soldiers at Ravenna.

Prosper has now no entry of the military exploits of Aetius till we reach the Burgundian war of 435. This last is also recorded by Idatius, who further records a Frankish campaign in 431. But between these two wars comes the most remarkable story of all, in which, for the first and last time, in the year 432, the names of Aetius and Boniface are directly brought together in any authentic narrative. Now at least we see them as enemies. Their enmity is the end of the career of Boniface; it is very far from being the end of the career of Aetius. Of his four consulships it is the year of the first, that which he shared with Valerius. As his last consulship led to his death, so his first led to his momentary fall. The story which Procopius heard in Africa sent Boniface to Italy, but said nothing as to his fate there. In our best authorities, the contemporary annals, we have again two versions which it may need some little pains to reconcile. Prosper tells us only that Boniface came to Ravenna from Africa to receive the rank of *magister militum*, that Aetius withstood him, that he overcame Aetius in battle and died of disease a few days later *.

* "Aetio et Valerio coss. Bonifacius ab Africa ad Italiam per Urbem venit, accepta magistri militum dignitate; qui cum sibi resistentem Aetium prælio superasset, paucos post dies morbo extinctus est." The

Idatius is rather fuller. In his version Boniface at the summons of Placidia comes to Ravenna as the rival of Aetius. Aetius is deprived of his office, which is given to Boniface. A few months later the rivals meet in fight, and Boniface receives a wound of which he dies *. From inferior authorities we get minuter details. The other Prosper, or Tiro, or whatever we are to call him, says that Aetius, after his consulship was over, took himself to strong places to escape Boniface, who had been sent for by Placidia. Then comes a fight of some kind in which Boniface has the better, but dies of a wound †.

Another of the endless versions which go under Prosper's name cuts the tale down to a few words, but tells us, what no other account does, the place of action. Aetius and Boniface fought five miles from Ariminum ‡. Count Marcellinus has more remarkable details still. By the stirring up of Placidia a great fight or war takes place between the patricians Boniface and Aetius. The day before the fight Aetius provides himself with a longer weapon than that of Boniface. Boniface is therefore wounded, while Aetius escapes unhurt. Three months later Boniface dies, counselling his wealthy wife Pelagia to marry no one except Aetius §.

geography here is remarkable. To go to Italy had, under Honorius and Placidia, become so completely the same thing as to go to Ravenna, that it was possible to speak of going from Africa to Italy through Rome. That was clearly the obvious way to get to Ravenna, as ten years before Boniface had gone from Ravenna to Africa by *portus Urbis*. In both places Ravenna is taken for granted.

* VIII Honorii; "Bonifacius in æmulationem Aetii de Africa per Placidiam evocatus in Italiam ad palatium rediit. Qui depulso Aetio in locum ejus succedens, paucis post mensibus, inito adversum Aetium conflictu, de vulnere quo fuerat percussus interiit." The "palatium" is of course at Ravenna, as before.

† IX Honorii; "Consulatu Aetius edito, Bonifacium, qui ab regina accitus ex Africa fuerat, declinans, ad munitiora conscendit. Bonifacius contra Aetium certamine habito, perculsus, victor quidem sed moriturus abscedit."

‡ This is the version published by Hille in his Inaugural Dissertation, Berlin, 1866, pp. 6, 15; "Aetio et Valerio. Pugna facta inter Aetium et Bonifacium in V (in quinto) de Arimino." The word "pugna" looks rather more like a single combat than some of the words used elsewhere; but it need not imply it.

§ "Valerio et Aetio coss. Placidiæ matris Valentiniani imp. instinctu,

Here at last Boniface and Aetius do appear as enemies; but in none of these versions is there any hint as to what made them so. Now we should be inclined to accept the story in Procopius as supplying us with the cause; only the story in Procopius can hardly be forced into agreement with the authentic narrative about Felix and Sigisvult, and it looks so very much as if it had arisen out of that narrative. Now in such an age as that, perhaps in any age, the two foremost men in the state are likely to be rivals; but up to this time there has been no authentic mention of their rivalry; they have been employed in two quite distinct scenes of action. At the time of the usurpation of John they were on opposite sides, but they did not come across each other. And if Aetius was then the rebel and Boniface the loyal commander, since that time their parts have been reversed. While Aetius was restoring the power of the empire in Gaul, an army had to be sent to Africa to bring Boniface to obedience. And now, at the moment when Aetius is promoted to the highest place in the republic, seemingly in the very year of his consulship, he is deprived of his office of *magister militum*, and Boniface is sent for from Africa to take it in his stead*. And all this was a sudden change without any assigned reason; never do we more earnestly wish for some source of knowledge fuller than mere annals. As it is, we can only say that in a despotic court anything may happen, and that the very services of Aetius and the height of greatness to which he had risen might be turned against him. The date seems fixed. The consul then, in the year of his consulship, is deprived of his

ingens bellum inter Bonifacium et Aetium patricios gestum est. Aetius longiore Bonifacii telo pridie sibimet præparato, Bonifacium congredientem vulneravit illæsus; tertioque mense Bonifacius vulnere quo sauciatus fuerat emoritur, Pelagiam uxorem suam valde locupletem nulli alteri nisi Aetio ut nuberet exhortans." Marcellinus is wrong in calling Aetius "patricius," which he did not become till the next year, while Boniface is not mentioned elsewhere as patrician at all.

* The statement in the article Bonifacius in the Dictionary of Biography about coins with the head of Boniface is pure misconception. The coins, or rather medals, that are meant have nothing to do with any Boniface.

military dignity, which is given to another; but he does not take the insult quietly: he resists in some way or another; a fight of some kind happens, which is followed by the death of Boniface. So far all stories agree: but there is diversity as to every detail. Boniface and Aetius meet in fight, but is it in single combat, an early case in short of the wager of battle, or is the quarrel to be looked on as rising to the scale of a civil war? For the single combat there seems to be hardly anything to be called authority. Marcellinus indeed clearly describes a single combat between Boniface and Aetius; but it reads like a single combat in a war; *ingens bellum*, even assuming that the later use of *bellum* could have come in so early, would be a strange phrase to describe a single combat only. And the other Prosper, who seems to connect the whole matter in some not very intelligible way with the appointment of Aetius as consul, clearly looked on Aetius as taking warlike precautions against Boniface, as occupying strong places, and his account of the death of Boniface would be more consistent with a general battle (*certamen*) than with a single combat. When we come to the contemporary writers, their language is vague; but there is nothing to suggest the thought of a single combat. *Prælium* and *conflictus* are words which imply the meeting of armies, not the meeting of single men. Boniface, according to Prosper, dies of disease, a statement perhaps not inconsistent with the version of Idatius that he died of a wound. But neither implies that the wound was given by the hand of Aetius. That version comes wholly from the account of Marcellinus in the next century. It is, I suspect, from his chronicle that the whole notion of the single combat has come; certainly no one would think of it from reading Prosper and Idatius only. What they suggest is rather that, after Aetius' appointment to the consulship, some dispute arose between him and Placidia—that she proposed to deprive him of his post as *magister militum* and to give it to Boniface—that Aetius, doubtless with an army in his actual command, withstood the transfer of office in arms—that a battle followed, in which Boniface had the better, but received a wound of which he died. This seems the natural interpretation of the words of

our two best authorities, and it gives a story far more likely in the fifth century than the story of the single combat. By what authority was the single combat to be fought? Is the empress-mother conceived as the queen of beauty presiding over the knightly contest?

> She took their hands; she led them forth into the court below;
> She bade the ring be guarded; she bade the trumpets blow;
> For lofty place for that stern race the signal she did throw;
> For truth and right the Lord will fight; together let them go.

It is hard to see by what law of Theodosius or of any earlier emperor the post of *magister militum* could be disposed of according to the issue of a single combat between the two illustrious candidates. Again, how are we to explain the issue of the combat? In Prosper, and in the other Prosper—Prosper Tiro—Boniface wins the battle, but dies of a wound received in it, a likely enough chance of ordinary warfare. But in a single combat, if Aetius, as Marcellinus says, himself unhurt, gave Boniface a deadly wound, then surely Aetius was the victor in the duel and was entitled to whatever was the prize of it. And as such Marcellinus seems to look upon him; at least he says nothing of any victory on the part of Boniface, which comes out so strongly in Prosper. Surely the real story is that Aetius now, like Boniface five years before, refused obedience to the imperial orders when those orders went to deprive him of his military post, and that Placidia sent for Boniface to bring him to obedience, exactly as Mavortius, Galbio, Sinox, and Sigisvult had been sent to bring Boniface to obedience. The thought does for a moment flash across the mind that in those strange times, where ever and anon some ancient form seems again to come into life for a moment, the consul of the republic may have fallen back on the powers of his office in an earlier day. It might too flash across the mind, considering the early importance of Aetius at Constantinople, that his nomination as consul came from the East, and was in some unexplained way unacceptable at Ravenna. The displeasure of Placidia is unexplained on any showing, and the consulship was the natural reward of the long tale of victories

in which Aetius had smitten nation after nation in the West, winding up with his great Frankish success the year before *. Gaul was for a moment at peace, and the conqueror and consul came to wear his laurels in Italy. To be degraded at such a moment by the caprice of a woman might stir any captain of those days to rebellion. On the whole the story reads far more as if the *æmulatio Aetii* of Idatius was a rivalry, possibly an intrigue, on the part of Boniface against Aetius rather than a rivalry or intrigue of Aetius against Boniface.

The best evidence then points to an open war between the two great captains. Can we recover any details of the campaign? There are several notices which may help us. First of all, we may fairly accept the statement of a single annal that the fight took place at the fifth milestone from Ariminum. No one was likely to indulge in invention on such a point as this, while nothing is more easy than for such a small bit of geography to be left out. As for the date of the fighting, according to the story in Idatius, Boniface, summoned by Placidia, displaces Aetius in his office, and some months later comes the fight in which Boniface receives his wound. This fits in curiously with the saying in the other Prosper about Aetius withdrawing before Boniface to strong places. These months were clearly occupied in preparations; then Aetius,

* Idatius, who has dealings of his own to record, thus brings in his eighth year of Valentinian, reckoning, it must be remembered, from the death of Honorius, after the manner of Charles the Second and Lewis the Eighteenth; "Superatis per Aetium in certamine Francis et in pace susceptis, Censorius comes legatus mittitur ad Suevos, supradicto secum Idatio redeunte. Bonifacius in æmulationem Aetii," &c. Wietersheim (Geschichte der Völkerwanderung, Band iv. p. 307) fully sees that what happened was a real battle, and he describes the forces on both sides in a way which is very likely in itself, but which it is hard to see in the authorities. Of course Aetius is "der ehrgeizige Feldherr" who "duldete keine Nebenbuhler"; he and Boniface are "die erbitterten Feinde," &c. According to this account, "Bonifacius kehrte zwar als Flüchtling, aber doch wohl mit einem nicht unbedeutenden Heer, aus Africa nach Italien heim." As for the battle, "wir dürfen des Aëtius Niederlage vielleicht durch sein schwächeres Heer, dessen grösster Theil in Gallien geblieben sein mag, und durch die besten Haustruppen der Kaiserin, welche dem Bonifacius überlassen worden sein mögen, erklären."

whether constrained or of his own will, leaves his strong places to meet his enemy in battle. He is defeated, but the victorious Boniface presently dies. As to his curious instructions to his wife, the wife whom, according to Augustine, he ought not to have married, we can say nothing. If we accept it, it can only be *quia impossibile.* What could have put it into anybody's head? It might seem a singular piece of advice, even if Aetius had been a single man or a widower. But it seems to go beyond all bounds of credible impossibility when we remember that Aetius had a very powerful, though nameless wife, daughter of Gothic kings and perhaps already aspiring to be mother of Roman emperors.

Let us look on a step further to the events that followed the fight and the death of Boniface. It is to be noticed that Marcellinus, who gives us the single combat and the instructions to Pelagia, has nothing to tell us as to what immediately followed. But the earlier writers have a good deal to say as to the immediate results of the quarrel, and from one of them we can perhaps learn what it was that put the notion of a single combat into anybody's head. Let us again compare our authorities.

Prosper is the fullest. According to him, Aetius, having lost or laid down his office, was living on his own estate. There a nameless enemy attempts a sudden attack on him. He then flees to Rome and thence to Dalmatia; from Dalmatia he goes to the Huns by way of Pannonia. He is still in good favour with his old friends; by their help, in some shape or other, he is restored to the favour of Placidia and Valentinian, and receives again the office that he had lost. After this Prosper does not mention Aetius again, except in relation to Gaulish affairs; he does not even record his death. In his annals the third consulship is a blank. But it is to be noticed that in 439 he gives Aetius the title of patrician, and that in 440, when speaking of Gaiseric's inroads in Sicily, he mentions that Gaiseric went back to Carthage, because Sebastian, a man skilled in war, had gone from Spain into Africa. He goes on to speak, but darkly, of the relations between Gaiseric and Sebastian and of the end of Sebastian.

But there is nothing in his account to imply that Sebastian had anything to do with the affairs of Aetius and Boniface *.

The account of Idatius lets us know that the Sebastian of Prosper's later story had a good deal to do with both Boniface and Aetius. He is the son-in-law of Boniface, and on his father-in-law's death he is appointed to his office, that of *magister militum*. But, being overcome by Aetius, he is driven from the palace at Ravenna. Aetius is restored to his old post; the next year he is raised to the rank of patrician. Of Aetius Idatius has nothing more to say—except in Gaul, where he has a good deal—till he records his last exploits and his death. But he has a great deal to tell us about the singular career of Sebastian. He flees to Constantinople, an event which may seem to be connected with the higher promotion of Aetius. The later entries about Sebastian do not greatly concern us. Only they go some way to explain the dark entry about him in Prosper. After very strange goings to and fro, he was put to death by Gaiseric, according to some accounts, as a Catholic martyr †.

The other Prosper has nothing to say about Sebastian, but

* Immediately after the death of Boniface, Prosper goes on, "Aetius vero, cum deposita potestate in agro suo degeret, ibique eum quidam inimicus ejus repentino incursu opprimere tentasset, profugus ad urbem, atque illinc ad Dalmatiam, deinde per Pannoniam ad Hunnos pervenit, quorum amicitia auxilioque usus, pacem principum et jus interpolatæ potestatis obtinuit." In 440, Valentiniano Augusto V et Anatolio coss., after a casual mention of Aetius in Gaul, we read, "Geisericus Siciliam graviter affligens, accepto nuntio de Sebastiani ab Hispania ad Africam transitu, celeriter Carthaginem rediit, ratus periculosum sibi ac suis fore si vir bellandi peritus recipiendæ Carthagini incubuisset. Verum ille amicum se magis quam hostem videri volens, diversa omnia apud barbari animum quam præsumpserat repperit, eaque spes causa illi maxima et calamitatis et infelicissimæ mortis fuit."

† Immediately after the death of Boniface, Idatius goes on, "Cui [Bonifacio] Sebastianus gener substitutus per Aetium de palatio superatus expellitur." The next year "Aetius dux utriusque militiæ patricius appellatur," and the next year "Sebastianus exsul et profugus effectus, navigat ad palatium Orientis." Other entries about him come in 444 and 450. A full account of his martyrdom is given in Victor Vitensis i. 19. He is there "Sebastianus famosi illius gener comitis Bonifatii, acer consilio et strenuus in bello." This is Victor's only mention of Boniface.

he has a great deal more to say about the Huns. After the battle with Boniface, Aetius flees to the Hunnish king Rugila, and asks his help. By that help he enters the Roman territory; then the Goths are called to give help against him by the Romans. In the next year Aetius is restored to favour, and peace is made with Rugila, who dies *.

Marcellinus has no further mention of Aetius till the time of his death. He in no way connects Sebastian with Aetius; but he mentions the flight of Sebastian from Constantinople and his death in Africa, seemingly bringing the two events too near together †.

When we come to compare these statements, there is no kind of contradiction between Prosper and Idatius. Each account is strangely imperfect, but each fills up gaps in the other. Prosper does not tell us what became of the office of *magister militum*, of which Aetius had been deprived to make room for Boniface, and which now again became vacant by the death of Boniface. We learn from Idatius that it was given to Sebastian, son-in-law of Boniface, husband, that must be, of a daughter of that earlier marriage of which Saint Augustine did not wholly disapprove. He tells us also that Aetius was able in some way or other to dispossess Sebastian. Prosper, though not mentioning Sebastian at this stage, tells us how Aetius came to dispossess him, and gives us some very curious details. Aetius for a moment withdraws into private life, but we may guess not without a purpose of coming back to the affairs of the world whenever he might have a chance. No longer *magister militum*, having been deprived of the office and having failed in his attempt to recover it in arms—for the death of Boniface after the battle must not make us forget the defeat of Aetius in the battle—he has no armies to command

* The death of Boniface is placed in the ninth year of Theodosius, according to his reckoning. Thus we read; "X. Cum ad Chunnorum gentem, cui tunc Rugila præerat, post prælium se Aetius contulisset, impetrato auxilio ad Romanum solum regreditur. Gothi ad ferendum auxilium a Romanis acciti. XI. Aetius in gratiam receptus. Rugila rex Chunnorum, cum quo pax firmata, moritur, cui Bleda successit." He says nothing more about Aetius till the year of his death.

† Under 435 "Theodosio XV et Valentiniano IV coss."

in Gaul, and he must have thought that it suited his purpose to stay for a while to watch the course of things in Italy rather than to risk an immediate attempt at seizing power in Gaul. He is clearly not harshly treated, as far as any public dealings went, by the court of Ravenna. He is allowed to withdraw to his private estate; he therefore had, as was likely enough, lands in Italy. While he is dwelling there a treacherous attempt is made on his life, whether by any secret commission from Placidia, Valentinian, or Sebastian, we have no means of judging. It reminds one of the attempt on Alkibiadês which Tissaphernês did order, and of the attempt on Hereward, which William did not. On the whole, without setting up Placidia very high, one had rather not fancy her practising the arts of Fredegund. Anyhow Aetius is more lucky than either Alkibiadês or Hereward; he escapes with life. Now surely we have here the kernel of truth out of which grew the legend of the single combat between Boniface and Aetius. Here is a personal attempt on Aetius, made, not by an army, but by one man or a few. In such a case something very like a single combat might easily take place; there are plenty of stories of the kind, the two to which I have just referred among them. Nothing could be easier than to mix up this story with that of the battle with Boniface. Aetius and Boniface met in fight; Aetius and somebody met in single combat; it was a slight change to make Aetius and Boniface meet in single combat. This seems likely enough to be the explanation of the story; but, of course, such an explanation is not needed for the general course of events. Anyhow, after the attempt on his life Aetius no longer thinks himself safe in Italy or anywhere in the Roman dominions; he must seek the help of the same barbarian friends whom he had seven years before brought to support the cause of John. We know not in what part of Italy his estate lay, but clearly somewhere where the haven of Rome was the nearest or safest point to take ship. In any case he takes a roundabout way to get to the Huns. The land journey through northern Italy might have brought him dangerously near to Ravenna. He therefore flees to Rome, clearly to set sail from Portus: he

makes the long voyage to Dalmatia, and so goes to the Huns. By their 'friendship and help,' whatever those words may imply, he procures his restoration to imperial favour and to his old office; this of course implies the deprivation of Sebastian, the one point recorded by Idatius.

Now what was the form of this Hunnish friendship and help, by which a Roman consul or consular is restored to a Roman office? Are we to think of Hunnish diplomacy as thus powerful, or did Aetius again bring a Hunnish force into the empire? It is at least certain that, if Placidia or her advisers yielded to Hunnish diplomacy, it could have been only because Hunnish diplomacy was ready to be backed by Hunnish force. The words in which Idatius records the removal of Sebastian, *superatus expellitur*, look very much like actual force. The fullest account is that of the other Prosper, to which we must give such an amount of trust as we may think good. This version does not necessarily imply an actual war, but it does imply a state of things on the very brink of war. A Hunnish invasion must have been looked for as very near when Gothic allies—West-Goths used to fight against Aetius—were summoned to give help to Rome. Goth and Roman might have met the Hun on other fields than the Catalaunian, in strife in which Aetius and Theodoric could not have fought side by side. If things had gone so far as this, we should surely have heard of it. Aetius 'came back to Roman soil by help of the Huns'; but this might surely be said though the action of the Huns did not go beyond a threatened march to the frontier, and though the summons to the Goths was not actually followed by their presence in Italy. Surely both dangers were avoided by the simpler process of receiving Aetius to his favour and displacing Sebastian from his office. We must not press the words *superatus* and *expellitur* too far; they look like force, but they do not absolutely prove it. At any rate the entries in Idatius show that Sebastian, though driven from the palace, remained for a while in Italy. It is only the next year that Aetius rises to the full height of the patriciate, and it is not till the year after that that Sebastian flees to Constantinople as an exile.

One is tempted to go on with the singular and striking story of Sebastian; but from this point it really has no bearing on the story or character of Aetius. More important is the fact, which we must take from the other Prosper, that a peace with the Huns followed the restoration of Aetius. There had therefore been a previous state of war, though not necessarily any actual fighting, and it seems plain that the restoration of Aetius was one of the conditions of peace. But we can perhaps find another. In the casual allusion of the best authority on Hunnish matters, that Priscus to whom we owe our living picture of Attila and his household, we hear of a peace of Aetius—like a peace of Nikias or of Antalkidas—by which Pannonia on the Save, that is most likely the land between Save and Drave, was given up to the Hun *. This peace was the last act of Rugila; he died to make way for Bleda and the mightier name of Attila. We see its fruits in the friendly relations so long kept up between Aetius and the Huns. Three years later than his return in 435, when he smites the Burgundians, the Huns come on to finish his work †. It is in his second consulship in 437 that the Gothic war is carried on by Hunnish help ‡. It is he who provides Attila with a Roman secretary §, who receives from Attila the singular gift of a Moorish dwarf and jester ‖, and when Valentinian sends an embassy to Attila, the Greek narrator of the event instinctively puts the name of Aetius before the

* Priscus, 146, 147; (Ὀρέστης) ᾤκει τὴν πρὸς τῷ Σάῳ ποταμῷ Παιόνων χώραν, τῷ βαρβάρῳ κατὰ τὰς Ἀετίου στρατηγοῦ τῶν ἑσπερίων Ῥωμαίων συνθήκας ὑπακούουσαν. Priscus, chiefly dealing with the affairs of the East, has to distinguish this treaty, then clearly of some standing, from the diplomacy of Theodosius and of Aetius himself in 448. Παίονες is of course high-polite for Pannonians.

† See Prosper, 435; "Theod. XV et Val. IV coss."

‡ Ib., 437; "Aetio II et Sigisvulto coss. Bellum adversus Gothos Hunnis auxiliantibus geritur."

§ Priscus, 176, 208.

‖ See his story in Priscus, pp. 205, 225 (Souidas in Ζέρκων). He belonged to Aspar; he was taken by the Huns in an inroad into Thrace; he became a favourite with Bleda, was inherited by Attila, given by him to Aetius, and by him back to his old master Aspar.

name of his master*. We should hardly have looked to see the crowning glory of his life in warfare in which the first great check is given to the advance of the Hunnish power.

It certainly seems to me that, by thus carefully turning our authorities inside out, we come to a narrative of events which differs a good deal from that which has been commonly received. Some parts of the real story have dropped out of notice. Such is all that concerns Castinus, Felix, and Sigisvult, and the relations of either Aetius or Boniface to any of those persons. The remarkable language of the annalists as to the position of Boniface in Africa, the undoubted fact of his resistance to the imperial orders, and the war which was therefore waged against him as a public enemy, have passed out of sight; so has the death of Felix and the share of Aetius in it. These are points of some importance both for the story and for the character of the two chief men; but they seem to have been very early forgotten. Instead of them we get the legend of the complicated intrigues of Aetius against Boniface, of the treasonable dealings of Boniface with Gaiseric, and of his later repentance. We have seen that for the intrigues of Aetius there is no real evidence, that the dealings of Boniface with Gaiseric, though likely enough, are very doubtful, and that, if they happened at all, they were caused, not by any plots of Aetius, but by the war declared against Boniface during the ministry of Felix. We come to the end of the joint career of the two men, and we find the main authority for the earlier legend silent, while another later writer supplies a romantic story of a single combat which has displaced the actual battle of the earlier annalists. I think I may claim—unless I have been forestalled at Dorpat—to have put the story together for the first time in its truth and fulness; but I must again repeat that the modern German writers, though they have, to my thinking, not made all that should have been made of the genuine materials, have by no means neglected them. I have to thank them for some refer-

* Priscus, 186; *πρέσβεις παρὰ Ἀετίου καὶ τοῦ βασιλεύοντος τῶν ἑσπερίων Ῥωμαίων ἐστάλησαν.* Did he not know Valentinian's name?

ences which I might not have lighted upon for myself. All that I complain of is that they confuse the story by bringing in the details of the Procopian legend as of equal authority with the contemporary annalists. And I believe that every entry of the annalists and every scrap of information about the matter to be found in any quarter has been brought together by Tillemont. Nothing ever escaped the notice of that most careful and valuable scholar; only in his simple good faith, he sometimes tried to believe two stories when it was impossible to believe both at the same time.

And now as to the characters of the two men with whom we have been dealing. Boniface we certainly leave a little in the dark. Our personal picture of him comes from Saint Augustine. It is that of a man who sets out with the highest promise, private and public, but who falls away from his duties, private and public. At one time almost a saint, with some tendency to become a monk, he sins against ecclesiastical rules, perhaps against moral rules also. At one time the model of a Roman officer, he neglects his duties in that character also, and leaves his province to be harried by barbarians. This is how Boniface appears in the letters of Augustine; only the legend has so taken hold of men's minds that, when Augustine writes about native Africans, they have chosen to read about Vandals. The picture drawn by Augustine is a very natural one; Boniface appears as one of the many men whose early days were their best. A more minute examination of the facts brings out nothing to set aside the witness of Augustine; it simply gives the political errors of Boniface a somewhat different character from that which they put on in the common story. While the charge of treasonable dealings with foreign enemies must be pronounced uncertain, we must charge him with distinct disobedience to his sovereign, and with neglect of official duty in a province which there is some reason to think that he had occupied irregularly. In his public character, in short, he is the man of the fifth century. In that ever-shifting age of revolutions, we cannot look for the same kind of loyalty, the same unswerving obedience to lawful authority, which we look for

either in a citizen of the old Roman commonwealth or in the subject of a modern constitutional state. Boniface was at least not below the common standard of his contemporaries; he was very likely above it. He really did nothing very memorable after his exploit at Massalia; his name has simply drawn to itself a special interest, partly from the legend of his relations to Aetius, partly also from his relations to Augustine. In this latter aspect he comes home to us in a way in which few captains of his age can come *. Of Aetius, of most other men of the time, we do not in the same way know either the private virtues or the private sins.

Whatever allowances we make for Boniface we must make for Aetius also. He also is a man of the fifth century, and is assuredly not free from the common faults of the fifth century. Only the faults which real history shows in him are not the same as those which we hear of in the legend. In the legend he appears as a man of subtle and unscrupulous intrigue. There is nothing like this in the genuine story; for we should hardly speak in this way of the wonderful diplomatic power which ever enabled him to bring some powerful ally to his side, which could bring the Hun to act against the Goth and the Goth to act against the Hun. His fault is the natural fault of a man in his position. Knowing his strength, both in himself and in the powers that he could call upon, he is too ready to appeal to force. In this he is simply the man of his time, neither better nor worse than Boniface. His rebellions, if they are to be so called, strike us more than the rebellion of Boniface, simply because his position allowed them to be wrought on a greater scale and to win greater success. If Aetius brought barbarian allies to decide Roman quarrels, it was no more than every man of his time, sovereign or subject, did if he had the chance. Indeed, if men were to fight at all, it was hardly possible for them to fight without barbarian allies. All wars of the time were fought with their help. When Aetius calls

* Unless indeed we remember that Dardanus, of whom Sidonius (Ep. v. 9) had so very bad an opinion, was also a friend and correspondent of the saint. There is a letter (Ep. lvii. or 187) in which Augustine discusses theology with him as freely as he does with Boniface.

in the Huns, all that Placidia can do is to call in the Goths. And if, with our notions, it seems uglier to call in Huns than to call in Goths, we can hardly expect the men of the fifth century to enter minutely into such distinctions, especially as Goth and Hun alike were called in simply as allies or mercenaries. Neither side does anything towards bringing in a Hunnish or Gothic dominion, though of course it was always possible that such thoughts might come into the minds of the Hunnish or Gothic allies themselves. And we may remark further that, though Aetius several times appeals to force against the measures of the reigning emperor, he never appeals to it to supplant the reigning emperor. When many a man, with such powers at his call as Aetius had, would at once have aimed at the tyranny, Aetius is satisfied with being restored to his old office. If at an earlier stage he appears as the supporter of a tyranny, it was at least not a tyranny in his own person, and we must remember that John, like so many others, is called tyrant and not emperor simply because he was unsuccessful. The only thing in the authentic story which looks the least like intrigue, as the intrigues of Aetius are commonly painted, is the story of the death of Felix. If that is intrigue, it is force as well; but we hardly know enough of the details to pass any judgement. We can only say that Aetius got rid of a man whom he deemed to be dangerous in some way which can hardly fail to have been irregular.

On the whole, Aetius comes out from his cross-examination as certainly something very unlike a faultless hero. All that we can say for him is that he is certainly not worse, that on the whole he is better, than the received standard of his time. He has the greatest opportunities of any man of his time, and, on the whole, for that time, he does not use them amiss. Of his opportunities for good he avails himself more than other men, of his opportunities for evil he avails himself less. We may fairly say that he is loyal to the empire and the emperor, even though he is fully determined to maintain, by force if need be, his own claim to be the first subject in the empire. The only act that looks like disloyalty to the republic itself is the cession of a certain Pannonian district to the Huns. Most

likely this was simply giving the Hunnish king a legal possession of a land which was already his for all purposes of plunder and havoc. By such a cession the sufferings of the Roman inhabitants of that land, if any were left, were pretty sure to be lessened. Except with a people who are ready to defend every inch of ground at the sword's point, the acknowledged mastery even of the Hun or the Turk is commonly a less evil than his ceaseless inroads from outside.

Of the two men with whose names we started, the career of Boniface is over; the most brilliant time of the career of Aetius is yet to come. Of his Gaulish career I hope to speak in another shape. We may then trace him alike in the dry entries of the annalists and in the sounding verse of the prelate of Auvergne. We may count up how often he beat back the Goth from imperial Arles, how he smote the Burgundian and taught the Frank to know his master. We may then dwell on that clearer tribute to the stoutest champion of Rome which the annalist pays when he takes for granted that, if Gaiseric could tear away Carthage from the republic, it was only because the sword of Aetius was busy against other foes in Gaul *. We may then tell of the great triumph of his diplomacy, when, like Demosthenês on his errand to Thebes, like Gellius Egnatius on his errand to Etruria †, he won his enemies to march at his side against their former allies. We may tell of the first and greatest European concert, when Roman and Goth and Frank —Catholic, Arian, and heathen—when Briton and Saxon, allies for a moment on Gaulish soil ‡, went forth together at the bidding of the last Roman of the West §. We may then tell how Saint Anian looked forth from the battlements of Orleans,

* Prosper; "Theodosio XVII et Festo coss. (439). Aetio rebus quæ in Galliis componebantur intento, Geisericus, de cujus amicitia nihil metuebatur, [XIV Kal. Nov.] Carthaginem dolo pacis invadit."

† Arnold's Rome, ii. cap. xxxiii. p. 331.

‡ See the list in Jordanis, Getica, 36; "Adfuerunt auxiliares Franci, Sarmatæ, Armoriciani, Liticiani, Burgundiones, Saxones, Ripari, Olibriones."

§ One may here fairly give Aetius the title that Procopius has devised for him, though not without some memories of Syagrius and Ægidius.

like our own Wulfstan from the battlements of Worcester *, and how the armies of the world met to take their fill of the joys of battle on the day of the Catalaunian fields. That was the day of the crowning glory of Aetius, the day of the great salvation wrought by him for all the Gauls, and for all the peoples, nations, and languages, that dwelt within their borders. Let the Goth serve the Roman or the Roman serve the Goth, rather than that both should see their common heritage trampled down by the horse-hoofs of the spoiler in whose track grass grows no more. But was the deliverance of Gaul only a step towards the more cruel harrying of Italy? We have heard how Aquileia was to fall and Venice was to rise, and how the Hun was to be turned away from Rome, not by the sword of Aetius the patrician, but by the voice of Leo the bishop. There is too a strange sound of complaint in the annals of the year which followed the victory of victories, as we read them in our Aquitanian guide. We hear how Attila, after losing his forces in Gaul, came again with new forces into Italy, how Aetius—"Aetius our leader," the annalist still calls him in fondness—did nothing worthy of the renown of the year that was past, how the very passes of the Alps were left unguarded, how the only counsel that the patrician could give to his sovereign was that they should both flee from Italy, how all that could be devised by the wisdom of prince and senate and people was that an embassy should be sent to ward off the wrath of the terrible foe. That was the embassy of the holy pontiff and his companions, famous in history, more famous in legend, most famous of all in the limner's craft †. At all this

* Jordanis, Getica, 39 ; "Ad certaminis hujus gaudia."

† Prosper here (452, "Herculano et Sporatio coss."), as in some other places towards the end of his story, seems almost to forget his character as an annalist, and indulges in the singular vein of complaint and commentary which I have tried to analyze. Attila comes "nihil duce nostro Aetio secundum prioris belli opera prospiciente, ita ut ne clusuris quidem Alpium, quibus hostes prohiberi poterant, uteretur, hoc solum spei suis superesse existimans, si ab omni Italia cum imperatore discederet." He adds, "cum hoc plenum dedecoris et periculi videretur, continuit verecundia metum." Presently "nihil inter omnia consilia principis ac *senatus populique Romani* salubrius visum est quam ut per legatos pax

Prosper wondered, and, if we accept his tale, we can only wonder too. We can only ask why Aetius left Italy to its fate, with as little hope of a full and perfect answer as when we ask why Heraclius left Jerusalem and Alexandria to their fate. Or may it be that there is no need for wonder? There is a counter-story from another annalist who has preserved to us the memory of many of the earlier exploits of Aetius. In the version of Idatius, Attila enters Italy, but he is driven to make peace with the empire by the sufferings which his army endures through a combination of causes, human and divine. Some die of hunger, some of disease, some by direct strokes from heaven; but most of all by the armies sent from the East, where the energetic Marcian now reigned—armies which Aetius again led to victory *. Which of these two contradictory versions are we to believe?

On the side of Prosper there is that commonly safe rule, a rule of such constant application in the earlier Roman history, which makes us always distrust stories of victories which have the air of being invented, perhaps to balance or conceal actual defeats, perhaps merely to get rid of the shame of simple inaction or other more negative kinds of ill-success. The victory recorded by Idatius might be a little discredited even if the year was a blank in Prosper; it seems to be yet more discredited when Prosper makes a positive complaint of the inaction of Aetius. Yet both annalists are very trustworthy; each often leaves things out; we have never had need to

truculentissimi regis expeteretur." Then follows the embassy of Leo, Avienus, and Trigetius; and in the end "rex gavisus est ut et bello abstineri præciperet et ultra Danubium promissa pace discederet." Jordanis (Getica, 41, 42) tells essentially the same story with some further details, specially that Attila threatened to come back, unless Honoria was sent to him. In neither is there any hint of warlike action on the part of Aetius, Marcian, or any one on the Roman side.

* Idatius, XXIX Valentiniani; "Secundo regni anno principis Marciani, Hunni qui Italiam prædabantur, aliquantis etiam civitatibus irruptis, divinitus partim fame, partim morbo quodam, plagis cælestibus feriuntur; missis etiam per Marcianum principem Aetio duce cæduntur auxiliis; pariterque in sedibus suis et cælestibus plagis et per Marciani subiguntur exercitum; et ita subacti, pace facta cum Romanis, proprias universi repetunt sedes, ad quas rex eorum Attila mox reversus interiit."

suspect either of inventing. And a Spanish bishop had no particular temptation to invent a deliverance of Italy by the means of armies sent by the Eastern emperor. After all, it is possible that we need not suspect anything more than what we have several times seen already, that one annalist preserves part of the story and the other another. We must conceive Aetius in Italy; but we must not conceive of him as at the head of forces such as those which he commanded in Gaul. His Goths and Franks, his Britons and Saxons, did not follow him beyond the Alps. The Goths at least were acting by imperial authority against a nearer enemy, Thorismund had succeeded the Theodoric who fell in the great battle—that first Theodoric from whom Aetius had so often delivered Arles. Thorismund had been slain by his brothers Theodoric and Frederic, and Frederic was now, by imperial commission, putting down the Bagaudæ south of the Pyrenees*. Aetius may have been really unable to put Italy into any state of defence till he received help from the East. That he thought of flight, that he counselled flight to Valentinian, comes under the head, not of facts open to all men, but of whispered surmises, as to which neither Prosper's statement nor that of anybody else goes for much. If troops did come from the East, if Aetius acted successfully against Attila, it is certainly strange that Prosper should not only have left out all mention of the fact, but should have spoken as he did about Aetius' earlier conduct. But it would be yet more strange if the statement of Idatius about the Eastern troops is all invention or delusion. A more serious difficulty is to reconcile a discomfiture of Attila, whether through natural or military causes, with the story of the embassy of Pope Leo and his colleagues Avienus and Trigetius, an embassy of which Idatius seems to know nothing. Of the reality of that embassy, witnessed by Prosper and by Priscus as represented by Jordanis, there can be no doubt; but it is quite possible that its circumstances

* Idatius records the murder of Thorismund under the twenty-ninth year of Valentinian, and in the next says; "Per Fredericum Theudorici regis fratrem Bacaudæ Tarraconenses cæduntur ex auctoritate Romana." This is the year of the death of Aetius.

may have been misunderstood. It takes something away from the beauty of the story, but it adds to its likelihood as an historical fact, if we believe that the holy awe inspired by the pontiff was backed, not only by the arguments of his lay comrades, the ex-consul and the ex-præfect, but by the more powerful argument of disease and hunger in his army, of the presence of Aetius in Italy at the head of the army of the East, and of the daring diversion on the Hunnish lands which another army of the East was making now the East had again a wise and watchful emperor.

And now we come to the last act of all, to the fourth consulship of Aetius, the last year of his power and of his life. The end of Aetius is in many things like the end of Stilicho, only Valentinian, unlike Honorius, had at least energy enough to do his crimes with his own hand. With Honorius indeed there is always the question whether we are to look on him as an accountable being or not. That Valentinian slew Aetius—that, according to the best accounts, he slew him with his own hands—that, as Sidonius puts it,

"Aetium Placidus mactavit semivir amens*"—

that the act was the act of one who, as the story pithily puts it, cuts off his right hand with his left †—so far all are agreed. About the circumstances, motives, and instigators of the act there is less agreement. It is to be noticed that the first fall and the death of Aetius, with two-and-twenty years between them, both come when he is in the height of power and glory. In his first consulship Placidia suddenly turns against him; the war with Boniface follows, and on that the attempt on Aetius' life and the other stirring events of the year. In his last consulship the son of Placidia suddenly turns against him; no war follows; but the attempt on his life is repeated success-

* Panegyric on Avitus, 359.

† Bell. Vand. i. 4 (p. 329); *Ῥωμαίων τις ἔπος εἰπὼν εὐδοκίμησεν. ἐρομένου γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλέως εἴ οἱ καλῶς ὁ τοῦ Ἀετίου θάνατος ἐργασθείη, ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων οὐκ ἔχειν μὲν εἰδέναι τοῦτο εἴτε εὖ εἴτε πη ἄλλη αὐτῷ εἴργασται, ἐκεῖνο μέντοι ὡς ἄριστα ἐξεπίστασθαι ὅτι αὐτοῦ τὴν δεξιὰν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ χειρὶ ἀποτεμὼν εἴη.* *Ῥωμαίων τις* here means a local Roman.

fully, for it is the emperor himself who attempts it. Aetius had escaped from meaner assassins at Constantinople and at some unknown place in Italy; in Rome he could not escape the weapon wielded by the hand of Augustus. For now we are at Rome; the Eternal City has again for a while come to the front; Valentinian has forsaken his mother's Ravenna, and keeps his court in the old home of empire. As to the causes which made Valentinian the enemy of the consul of 454 we are not so utterly in the dark as we were as to the causes which made Placidia the enemy of the consul of 432. Let us follow the account of Prosper. A fierce quarrel arises between the emperor and the consul and patrician out of a cause which the annalist says ought to have been a cause of friendship, an agreement, it would seem, for the marriage of their children *. Valentinian, we know, had daughters; Aetius had sons; it is impossible not to connect this notice of Prosper with the hints in Sidonius which have been already referred to about the wife of Aetius—there is nothing said about Aetius himself—seeking the empire for her son Gaudentius †. Here is another point of likeness to Stilicho; he too was believed to be seeking the empire for his son Eucherius. It is easy to believe that the agreements and oaths of which Prosper speaks as concluded between Valentinian and Aetius may have had something to do with some scheme, not only for a marriage between Gaudentius and one of the emperor's daughters, but for securing to them the succession to the empire or an association in it. Such a scheme might come naturally when Aetius was at the height of his glory, patrician, four times consul, deliverer of Gaul, perhaps deliverer of Italy. But no scheme would be more likely to stir up the jealousy of Valentinian, already perhaps disposed to envy and hate Aetius on the very ground of his greatness and glory. Valentinian

* Prosper; "Aetio et Studio coss. Inter Valentinianum Augustum et Aetium patricium, post promissa invicem fidei sacramenta, post pactum de conjunctione filiorum, diræ inimicitiæ convaluerunt, et unde fuit gratia charitatis augenda, inde exarsit fomes odiorum, incentore, ut creditum est, Heraclio spadone, qui ita sibi imperatoris animum insincero famulatu astrinxerat ut eum facile in quæ vellet impelleret."

† See above, p. 319, note ‡.

would most likely have no more fondness for successors, colleagues, and sons-in-law, than Charles of Burgundy had. Valentinian, according to Prosper, was, like so many other princes, under the dominion of an eunuch named Heraclius, who stirred him up against Aetius, and made him believe that his only hope for safety was to forestall the plot of his supposed enemy by his destruction*. Then comes the end. Aetius is in the palace. He demands the fulfilment of the emperor's promises: he presses the claims of his son, whatever they were, with vehemence. Then he is slain, Valentinian, it would seem, dealing the first blow, and those who stood by finishing the work with their swords. Boetius the prætorian præfect is killed at the same time, his crime being firm friendship for Aetius †.

Idatius tells us that Aetius was by guile invited alone to the palace, and there killed by the hand of the emperor himself. Other honourable men were brought in one by one, and killed by his *spatharius* ‡. As to the cause, he gives a dark hint in his entry for the next year, namely that the wicked counsels of Petronius Maximus had something to do with the deaths of all these persons §. Marcellinus also, in the same incidental way, attributes the deed to Maximus. He says that Aetius and his friend Boetius were both killed in the palace by the emperor. He laments the fall of Aetius with much rhetoric;

* Prosper, u.s.; "Cum ergo Heraclius sinistra omnia imperatori de Aetio persuaderet, hoc unum creditum est saluti principis profuturum, si inimici molitiones suo opere præoccupasset."

† Ib.; "Aetius dum placita instantius repetit, et causam filii commotius agit, imperatoris manu et circumstantium gladiis crudeliter confectus est; Boethio præfecto prætorio simul perempto, qui eidem multa amicitia copulabatur." "Placita" must here mean a meeting or interview, as often in Gregory of Tours.

‡ Idatius, XXX Val.; "Aetius dux et patricius fraudulenter singularis accitus intra palatium manu ipsius Valentiniani imperatoris occiditur. Et cum ipso per spatarium ejus aliqui singulariter intromissi jugulantur honorati." Is "honorati" here to be taken in a technical sense? and the "spatharius" seems to come in early.

§ "Valentiniano VIII et Anthemio coss. (455). Qui [Maximus] . . . non sero documento quid animi haberet probavit, siquidem interfectores Valentiniani, non solum non plecterit, sed etiam in amicitiam receperit." He goes on about Eudoxia. Prosper. Aq.

he was the great salvation of the Western republic, the terror of King Attila; with him fell the Hesperian realm, and it had never risen again down to his own day *.

The introduction of Petronius Maximus at once brings us to the account in Procopius. He brings the death of Aetius into his doubtful story about Valentinian and the wife of Maximus †. According to Procopius the murder of Aetius is part of a very subtle scheme of vengeance by which Maximus wishes to repay his own wrongs on Valentinian. He wishes to be emperor himself, and thinks that he will be more likely to succeed if Aetius can be got out of the way. The eunuchs are favourable to his plans; they persuade Valentinian that Aetius is designing a revolution. With Valentinian the power and merit of Aetius is enough of itself to make him believe the charge. He kills Aetius, and a nameless Roman makes the sharp saying which has been already quoted ‡.

The story about the wife of Maximus must be examined on its own grounds, apart from that of the death of Aetius. I am strongly inclined to think that it sprang, in the strange way in which such stories often do spring, out of the unwilling marriage of Eudoxia to Maximus. But Idatius, who has nothing to say about the wife of Maximus, distinctly charges Maximus with a hand in the death of Aetius; and Marcellinus, who also knows nothing of the legend, either follows Idatius or repeats the same story from another quarter. It is therefore no part of the legend, but an independent statement, true or

* "Aetio et Studio coss. Aetius magna occidentalis reipublicæ salus et regi Attilæ terror, a Valentiniano imp. cum Boetio amico in palatio trucidatur, atque cum ipso Hesperium cecidit regnum, nec hactenus valuit relevari."

† Bell. Vand. i. 4 (p. 329); *περιώδυνος τοίνυν ὁ Μάξιμος τοῖς ξυμπεσοῦσι γενόμενος αὐτίκα μὲν ἐς ἐπιβουλὴν τοῦ βασιλέως καθίστατο, ὡς δὲ τὸν Ἀέτιον ἐώρα μέγα δυνάμενον . . . ἐνθύμιόν οἱ ἐγένετο ὥς οἱ Ἀέτιος εἰ τὰ πρασσόμενα ἐμπόδιος ἔσται· ταῦτά τε διανοουμένῳ ἄμεινον ἔδοξεν εἶναι τὸν Ἀέτιον ἐκποδὼν ποιήσασθαι πρότερον, οὐδὲν ποιησαμένῳ ὅτι ἐς αὐτὸν περιέστηκε πᾶσα ἡ Ῥωμαίων ἐλπίς. τῶν δὲ ἀμφὶ τὴν βασιλέως θεραπείαν εὐνούχων εὐνοϊκῶς οἱ ἐχόντων ἀνέπεισε ταῖς αὐτῶν μηχαναῖς βασιλέα ὡς νεωτέροις πράγμασιν ἐγχειροίη Ἀέτιος, Οὐαλεντινιανὸς δὲ ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ὅτι μὴ τῇ Ἀετίου δυνάμει τε καὶ ἀρετῇ τεκμηριώσας τὸν λόγον ὑγιᾶ εἶναι κτείνει τὸν ἄνδρα.*

‡ See above, p. 59, note *.

false, which has been incorporated in the legend. We have no means of either confirming or refuting the account of Idatius; it simply comes under the general rule that secret intrigues are for the most part probable but not proved. The intrigue, if it happened, must have been very secret, for, if we accept the plain statement of Prosper, the friends of Aetius knew that the eunuch Heraclius had been the enemy of their chief, but had no suspicion of Maximus. Valentinian, he tells us, was so unwise that he took the friends and military attendants of Aetius into his service. They watched their opportunity, and slew both him and Heraclius at some point outside the city. No one of all the imperial following stirred to defend or to avenge them *. The possible complicity of Maximus in the deed is darkly hinted at a little later, when it is said that, on assuming the empire, he took the slayers of Valentinian into his favour †.

Idatius is shorter; but he adds that the slayers were, as we might have expected, barbarian followers of Aetius. He calls the place where Valentinian was killed *campus*, and adds that the army was standing around ‡. The Campus Martius was within the walls of Aurelian, but as being still an open place used for exercises, it might be laxly spoken of as outside the city. The very short account in another version of Prosper gives the spot a name—the Two Laurels §. Marcellinus, as we

* "Mortem Aetii mors Valentiniani non longo post tempore consecuta est, tam imprudenter non declinata ut interfecti Aetii amicos armigerosque ejus sibimet consociaret. Qui concepti facinoris opportunitatem aucupantes, egressum extra Urbem principem et ludo gestationis intentum inopinatis ictibus confoderunt, Heraclio simul, ut erat proximus, interempto, et nullo ex multitudine regia ad ultionem tanti sceleris accenso." See Ducange in "Gestatio."

† See above, p. 366, note §.

‡ "Quarto regni anno principis Marciani per duos barbaros Aetii familiares Valentinianus Romæ imperator occiditur in campo exercitu circumstante."

§ Prosperi Chron. ex MS. August. Roncalli, 701. "Aetio et Studio. Eo anno occisi sunt Aetius et Boetius Patricii. Valentiniano VIII et Anthemio. Valentinianus ipse occisus ad duas lauros XVII Kal. Apr." So Chron. Pasch. i. 591; *τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει ἐσφάγη Οὐαλεντινιανὸς Αὔγουστος ἐν Ῥώμῃ μέσον δύο δαφνῶν.*

have seen, asserts the complicity of Maximus in the death of Valentinian; he also gives the slayers the barbarian names of Optila and Transtila*. On the whole it is enough to say that Valentinian was slain by men of Aetius who wished to avenge the blood of their lord. That is plain. Maximus may have had some hand in setting them on at some particular time or in some particular way. If so, he was only the occasion and not the cause. Men who had shared the glories of Aetius and who mourned for his murder, had motive enough to act as the avengers of his blood; they had a strong enough *fœhde* against his murderer, whether an ambitious consular and patrician took advantage of their disposition or not.

And so we end the story of Aetius, as we have some years before ended the story of his supposed rival. To Aetius four times consul the Britons might have sent up yet heavier groans than they sent when he bore the fasces for the third time. Before he had beaten back the Hun, the tale of the second England had begun. The rest of the world seems to have been but slightly stirred in the year when the Jutish ealdormen landed at Ebbsfleet, never to fall back. But what mattered the sufferings of Kent when the Hun was arming against Europe? Six years later, Theodoric, Attila, Aetius, have all passed away; Valentinian dies by an irregular vengeance for his crimes. In the same year, of the two Teutonic *heretogan* who had begun the Making of England, one dies in fight with the Briton, the other becomes the first Teutonic king on British soil. In the consulship of Valentinian and Anthemius, we turn from Aquitanian Prosper and Spanish

* "Valentinianus princeps dolo Maximi patricii, cujus etiam fraude Aetius perierat, in campo Martio per Optilam et Transtilam Aetii satellites, jam percusso Heraclio spadone, truncatus est." So Jordanis, Getica, 45. We get a little nearer to one of the slayers in Gregory of Tours, ii. 8 (ad fin.); "Adultus Valentinianus imperator metuens ne se per tyrannidem Aetius opprimeret, eum nullis causis extantibus interimit. Ipse postmodum Augustus dum in campo Martio pro tribunali residens concionaretur ad populum, Occila buccellarius Aetii adversum veniens eum gladio perfodit. Talis utrisque extitit finis." This, according to Holder-Egger, comes from the lost annals of Ravenna.

Idatius to our own tale in our own tongue: "An. ccccIv. Her Hengest and Horsa gefuhton wiþ Wyrtgeorne þæm cyninge on þære stowe þe is gecweden Ægleslþrop; and his broðor Horsan man þær ofsloh, and æfter þæm feng to rice Hengest and Æsc his sunu."

APPENDIX II.

THE SECOND CARAUSIUS.

Mr. Arthur J. Evans, in the Numismatic Chronicle, vii., 3rd series, pp. 191–219, has given reasons for the existence of a Second Carausius of the fifth century. A bronze coin was found at Richborough, with the inscription on the obverse, about the Emperor's diademed and be-cloaked bust, to be read: DOMINO C$\overline{\text{ARAVSIO}}$ C$\overline{\text{ES}}$*; and on the reverse, about the Emperor with phœnix and *labarum* standard at the vessel's prow steered by Victory, an inscription to be read: DOMIN[O] CO$\overline{\text{NXTA}}$[$\overline{\text{NTI}}$]NO. These particulars would fix its prototype between 340 and 350 A.D. "Evidently it records a maritime expedition . . . it must refer to Constans' passage to Britain in 343, in answer to the appeal of the hard-pressed provincials —one of the most important episodes of his reign, as may be gathered from the reference to it in the later books of Ammianus Marcellinus"; to wit, xx. 1. 1; xxvii. 8. 4. But the coin itself must be, Mr. Evans thinks, of considerably later date; the ligatures, form of letters S and R, and style of legend, compare with the well-known Christian Penmachur inscription, C$\overline{\text{ARAVSIVS}}$ HIC IACIT IN HOC C$\overline{\text{ONGERIES}}$ L$\overline{\text{API}}$-DVM, and also with the Ravenhill inscription, which is dated by its reference to Justinian, Constantine's officer, the companion in arms, as we have seen, of Nebiogast (Zôsimus, vi.), and the victim of Stilicho's general Sarus. The Justinian

* I have marked the ligatures by a line above the letters linked together.

inscription would seem to date from a short time before 407, and is read: IVSTINIANVS PP VINDICIANVS MA[R]-BITERIV (or MAGISTERIV) PR M CASTRVM FECIT A[NN]O . . . Hence Mr. Evans would refer this Carausius coin to the year 409. "The association of our Carausius with the British Constantine indicated by the present coin, may at least be taken as evidence that the new Cæsar stood forth as the representative of the interests of the Constantinian dynasty in the island as against the faction of the rebel Gerontius and his barbarian allies. It is not unlikely even that he belonged to the same family as Constantine III. The probability that the later Romano-British princes, Ambrosius Aurelianus, Constantine of Damnonia, Aurelius Conan, and others, traced their descent from the third Constantine, has already been shown by Dr. Guest." Cf. Gildas, Hist. xxv. Origines Celticæ, ii. 172. There is much else in Mr. Evans' paper that is of interest, especially where he considers the use of *Rex*, *Dux*, and *Conventus*, in fifth-century Britain. He has an excellent page upon the "titular authority" of the Roman emperors after the overthrow of the direct imperial government in Britain in 409, and the "sentimental veneration" with which they were regarded down to Gildas' days. "Honorius, by his letters to the cities of Britain, was careful to legalize the new state of things, and the very instrument that abrogated the direct government of his officials still asserted his dominion. The embassy of the Britons to the Consul Aetius implied the recognition of his titular sovereign, the Emperor Valentinian III. The mission of St. Germanus was itself a rehabilitation of the spiritual sway of Rome, as against the incursions of Celtic heterodoxy; and the Synod of Verulamium was, from every point of view, a re-cementing of the ties that still bound Britain to the *Respublica Romana*." The British prince Riotimus*, *Rex Britonum*, as Jordanis calls him, cheerfully helped the Emperor Anthemios against Euric and his Wisi-

* This is the king "Riens" or Ryence, of North Wales, and of all Ireland and of many Isles, the giant monarch whose mantle was purple with the beards of eleven subject kings, the foe of Arthur, the captive of Balin and Balan. Malory, Mort Arthur, i. cap. xxxiv.

goths in Gaul in 470. Cf. Gregory of Tours, ii. 19. Gildas himself (De Excidio, xiii.) is furious against the British emperor, Magnus Maximus, who had dared to rise against "his lords, the two legitimate emperors."

Professor Rhŷs has shown that the name Carausius has left its traces in place-names and legends in Britain. Nennius (Hist. Brit. xxiii. p. 165) makes him a perfect British Balbus.

INDEX

Ægidius, subject of Marjorian, 258.
preserves Roman power at Soissons and Paris, 258.
father of Syagrius, 260.
Aetius, marries wife of royal Gothic blood, 272.
goes to Gaul as officer of Valentinian, 274.
induces Huns to return home, 274.
brings help for John from the Huns, 274.
his warfare with Theodoric, cf. note, 276.
attack on Theodoric before Arles, 281.
gains second victory over Goths, near Arles, 283.
third consulship, 305.
foresees approach of Attila, 307.
his relations with Theodoric, 308.
friend of the Huns, 308.
adviser of Placidia, 308.
rival of Boniface, 308.
keeps his place by help of Huns, 309.
son of Gaudentius, 317.
hostage with Alaric, 318; with the Huns, 318.
wife of, a saintly matron, 319.
præfect of Constantinople, 320.
enters service of Placidia, 325.
Aetius, the Huns fight against Valentinian, 325.
supposed connexion with fall of Boniface, 332.
magister militum, 341.
and Boniface, an account of their duel, 347, 348.
flees to Rugila, 352.
restored to favour, 352.
attempt on his wife, 353.
flees to Rome, 353.
goes to Dalmatia, 354.
his peace with the Huns, 355.
supplies Attila with a Moorish jester, 355.
summary of his character, 358.
seeks empire for his son Gaudentius, 365.
Agathoklês, first to assume title of Tyrant, 84.
Agen, in hands of West-Goths, 238.
Agrætius, an Avernian noble, slain, 189.
Alans, kingdom in Spain, 20.
take part in invasion of Gaul, 20.
settle in Lusitania, 141.
settle at New Carthage, 141.
army of, weary of Gothic alliance, 194.
their dominion in Spain, 232.
commend themselves to Vandal King Guntheric, 232.

Alaric, his coming, the cause of the loss of Britain, 17.
to be sent against Constantine, 59.
besieges Rome, 89.
intended to cross over to Sicily, 228.
Alamannian land, borders of, 299.
war, the second, unrecorded, 299.
Alamans, their new settlements, 301.
Allobich, commands Roman cavalry, 90.
murdered, 93.
Angles and Saxons, form part of the Wandering of the Nations, 36.
Angoulême, in the hands of the West-Goths, 238.
Apollinaris, goes with Constans to Spain, 76.
deposition of, 96.
Ardaburius and Aspar, help Valentinian against John, 324.
Argentoratum, Nether-Dutch Strateburg, 37.
Arles, Arelate, Constantine reigns there, 55.
crown of, 56.
besieged by Gerontius, 108.
topography of, 109.
statio navium, 109.
captured by Constantine, 121.
account of, 255.
supplants Trier, 256.
head of land south of Loire, 256.
besieged by King of West-Goths, 276.
Armorica, its original extent, 167.
Armorica, probably recovered for Rome by the sword of Wallia, 248.
Aspar, assists Boniface and raises siege of Hippo, 336.
mission to Africa, 341.
Asterius, the Roman count, leads Vandals in Bætica, 235.
Atawulf, accession changes relations of Romans and barbarians in Italy, 131.
promises heads of Jovinus and Sebastian to Honorius, 184.
estimate of his view of the rule of Rome, 178.
passes into Spain, 215.
counsels peace to the Goths, 220.
how his history was preserved, 227.
Atax, the Alan king, overthrown by Wallia, 232.
Attalus, counsellor to Atawulf, 180.
emperor in Gaul, 201.
sent to Honorius as a peace-offering, 216.
adorns triumph of Honorius, 216.
exiled to Lipari Isles, 217.
Augusta Trevirorum, see Trier, sacked, 29.
Augustine, St., his letters to Boniface, 327.
Avienus, embassy of, 363.
Avitus, proclaimed at Toulouse, 254.
of Auvergne, 284.
smites a wild boar, 285.
his studies of Cicero, 285.
obtains remission of taxes for Auvergne, 285.
goes to see Theodosius, 286.

Avitus, Theodoric tries to win him, 286.
the new Fabricius, 286.

Bæda, on separation of Britain, 11.
Bagaudæ, Sarus gives them the spoil taken from Justinian, 64.
Barbarians, ravage Gaul, 134.
settle down in Spain, 134.
Barcelona, infant Theodosius dies and is buried at, 219.
Bayeaux, a Saxon city, 5.
Belisarius, consul, 306.
Bellerid, officer of Sarus, slain, 182.
Bleda, succeeds Rugila as king of Huns, 352.
Boetius, friend of Aetius, killed, 366.
Boniface, ecclesiastical side of, 310.
Procopius' account of, 311.
relieves Massilia from siege of Atawulf, 314.
avenges injured soldier, 316.
marries Pelagia, 328.
possible visit to Spain, 329.
regarded as a foe at Ravenna, 331.
magister militum, 344.
contends with Aetius at Ravenna, 344.
dies of disease, 344.
and Aetius, an account of their duel, 347, 348.
summary of his character, 357.
Bononia, Boulogne, landing-place of Constantine, 48, 49.
Bourdeaux, or Bordeaux, Goths enter peacefully, 197.
Bourdeaux, plundered and burnt by Goths, 207.
in the hands of the West Goths, 238.
Bret-wealas, join Rum-wealas against Goths and Saxons, 247.
Britain, supposed unsuccessful invasion of, by barbarians in Gaul, 146.
withdrawal of Roman legions, 149.
embassies from, 150.
Gildas' account of persecutions in, 151.
Zôzimos' account of, 153.
Procopius on loss of, 153.
Pelagian heresy in, 156.
mission of Germanus and Lupus to, 157.
brought under power of Saxons, 158.
Belisarius offers to exchange, 159.
Frankish kings claim overlordship, 160.
rise of Gallic, 162.
early and brief independence of lesser, 168.
British people, freedom necessary to growth of English in Britain, 148.
Britons, not spoken of as Romans, 155.
never became Romans in speech or habits, 155.
groans of, to Aetius, 156, 305.
on the Loire, 164.
the continental, friends of Rome, 247.
and Saxons, their doings in Gaul only secondary, 267.
Burgundians, earlier independence in Gaul, 172.
no settlement in Gaul before fifth century, 174.

Burgundians, settlement under Gunthachar, 176.
the first Teutonic settlement in Gaul, 176.
orthodox Christians, 192.
Burgundy, on the middle Rhine, 173.
kingdom of, on western border of the Rhine, 190.

Cahors, in hands of West-Goths, 239.
Candidianus, influence of, 198.
Carausius II, evidence for his existence, 371.
Carpilio, son of Aetius, 319.
Cassiodorus, the elder, prefect at Rome, 299.
the younger, writes in name of Theodoric, 299.
Castinus, takes Roman force against Vandals in Spain, 235.
retires on Tarragona, 235.
fails in Spain, 235, 315.
enemy of Boniface, 309.
commands expedition to Spain, 314.
banished, 326.
Celtic corner of Gaul more than survival of a people, 144.
Chariobaudes, flight of, 50.
represents Honorius in Gaul, 50.
slaughter of, 60.
Chastity of Teutonic nations, 139.
Chilperic and Guntchramn, tale of, 292.
Chlodowig, an officer of Zeno, 37.
Chlodowig, did he enter Paris to chastise tyrant? 260.
master of Soissons, 288.
displaces Syagrius, 288.
Chlodowig, conversion of, 291.
Avitus of Vienne congratulates him, 291.
calls on the God of his wife at Zülpich, 296.
battle with Alamans between Toul and the Rhine, 298.
marches back to Rheims, 298.
Chrotechild, wife of Chlodowig, her influence, 291.
wooed by Chlodowig, 295.
Claudian, hexameters of, 9.
poems of, 15.
Cruelty, marked fault of Saxons according to Salvianus, 138.
Constans, son of Constantine, 57.
sent by Constantine to put down rising in Spain, 75.
raised to rank of Augustus, 92.
flees from Gaul, 103.
put to death by Gerontius, 108.
Constantine, colleague of Honorius, 30.
elected by legions in Britain, 47.
carries legions to Gaul, 48.
lands at Bononia, 48.
guards the Rhine, 52.
his firm guarding of the Rhine frontier, 52.
dominions in Gaul, 53.
restores Trier, 53.
reigns at Arelate, 55.
firmly established in S.E. Gaul, 65.
campaign in Spain, 68, 69.
ruler of Spain, 79.
the Tyrant, meaning of title, 82.
demands of Honorius the

rank of third Augustus, 87.
Constantine, sends embassy to Ravenna, 87.
enters Italy, 91.
raises his son Constans to rank of Augustus, 92.
turned back at Verona, 94.
at Arles, 106.
takes sanctuary, 121.
is made presbyter, 121.
sent prisoner to Ravenna, 122.
beheaded, 122.
head set up at Carthage, 127.
power reached only to Trier, 173.
Constantius, born at Naïssus, 111.
cuts off ears of Olympius, 112.
drives Atawulf from Gaul, 206.
taught the Goth that the Roman could strike, 268.
saves Roman power in Gaul, 268.
Curius, consul, 356.

Dardanus, estimate of his character, 180.
with Atawulf before Valentia, 186.
Darius, the Count, makes peace between Boniface and Ravenna, 340.
Demosthenes, his errand to Thebes, 360.
Didymus, kinsman of Honorius in Spain, 70.
resists Constantine, 70.
captured by Constans, 77.
put to death by Constantine, 78.
Dombrowka, of Poland, reference to, 292.
Dubius, murders Atawulf, 219.

Ecdicius, carries head of Edobich to Constantine, 120.
Edobich, general of Constantine, 63.
collects Alamans, 105.
brings barbarians to relief of Constantine in Arles, 118.
defeated outside Arles by Constantius, 119.
flees for refuge to Ecdicius, 120.
murdered by Ecdicius, 120.
Einhard, story of Britons fleeing to Gaul, 164.
English envoys to court of Justinian, 160.
Eoforwulf, annoyed by Atawulf's gibes, 219.
Eormengild, revolt of, 305.
Ermeric, chief of Suevians, 135.
Euplutius, Roman envoy to Wallia, 229.
Euric, drives Britons from land of Bituriges, 164.
the West-Goth, 255.
Eusebia, inscription on her tomb at Trier suggests consulship of Constantius and Honorius, 92.
Eusebius, the eunuch, chamberlain of Honorius, 90.
Exsuperantius, restores Armorica to the Empire, 168.
of Poitiers, 273.
asserts claim of Theodosian house, 273.

Famine in Spain, owing to barbarian ravages, 136.
Fauriel, Histoire 2.
Felix, *magister militum*, 283, 326.

Felix, enemy of Boniface, 309.
killed by order of Aetius at Ravenna, 309, 342, 343.
Placidia's minister at Ravenna, 337.
Frank, the heathen, contrasted with the Arian Goth, 290.
Franks, Vandals attempt to stop their invasion of Gaul, 28.
overthrown by the Alan Respendial, 28.
the Nether-Dutch speech of, 36.
still heathen, 246.
their wars with Alamans, 296.
Frederic, puts down the Bagaudæ, 363.
Frigeridus, Renatus Profuturus, quoted by Gregory of Tours, 7.
Frithbald, Vandal king in Spain, 233.
sent as trophy to Honorius, 233.

Gaiseric, was he invited by Boniface? 333.
real story concerning him, 338.
Galba, besieges Boniface, 332.
Gaudentius, account of, 318.
father of Aetius, 320.
slain in Gaul, 320.
count and *magister militum*, 320.
Gaudentius II, son of Aetius, 319.
Gaul, date of Teutonic invasion of, 19.
not invaded by remnants of army of Radagaisus, 22.
ravaged by Saxons, 35.
comparison of conquest by Franks with that of Britain by English, 148.
Gaul, occupied by Goths, Huns, and Vandals, and still under Roman rule, 247.
causes of abiding differences between North and South, 251.
historic light of, helps us to pierce darkness of Britain, 267.
Gellius Egnatius, his errand to Etruria, 360.
Germans, of the sea, 38.
Gerontius, general of Constantine, 63.
same as British Gerent, 64.
goes with Constans to Spain, 74.
leagues with barbarians, 97.
divides Spain, 98.
sets up Maximus, his son, as Tyrant, 100.
advances against Constans, 105.
his army goes over to Constantius, 115.
flees to Spain, 115.
besieged by his troops in Spain, 123.
commits suicide, 125.
Goar, the Alan king, helps Jovinus at Mainz, 172.
and Alans join and help the Romans, 174.
protect Bazas from Goths, 213.
Godegisl, Vandal king, killed, 28.
Goth, a, sends payment to Paulinus for lands he occupied, 244.
his conquests cut off Roman central Gaul, 257.
Gothic people to settle on the Garonne, 234, 236.

Gothic Aquitaine did not take in whole of the first Aquitaine, 240.
West G. kingdom, first Teutonic power in Gaul, 245.
conquest of Gaul rooted out traces of earlier speech, 253.
Goths, appearances in Gaul, 172.
the West, enter Gaul under Atawulf, 174.
at war with Romans in S. Gaul, 196.
settle in Aquitaine at cost of Romans, 243.
the chaste, come to cleanse Aquitaine, 243.
and Romans, friendship lasts during reign of Wallia, 249.
and Empire, formal peace between, 284.
cleave to teaching of their first apostle, 289.
engage to win back Spain to Empire, 330.
Gratian, elected Tyrant by legions in Britain, 46.
death of the British, 46.
Gregory of Tours on Stilicho, 27.
his reference to Britons in Gaul, 104.
Guntchramn and Chilperic, tale of, 292.
Gunthachar, the Burgundian, 172, 174.
a lieutenant of the Empire, 191.
his name in Epic of Nibelungs, 193.
ally of Jovinus, 248.
Guntheric, master of New Carthage and Seville, 236.

Harold and Tostig, compared with Boniface and Aetius, 312.
Helvetia, parts of, settled by Alamans, 301.
Heraclian, the slayer of Stilicho, 184.
asserts independence in Africa, 184.
Heraclius, the eunuch, the enemy of Aetius, 368.
Heros, bishop of Arles, 282.
his deposition, 282.
partisan of Constantine, 283.
Honoria, daughter of Placidia, is wooed by Attila, 223.
Honorians, name of Constans' soldiers, 75.
Honorius, laws of, 24.
his laws may refer to invasion of Gaul, cf. note, 24.
under influence of Olympius, 60.
acknowledges Constantine, 88.
sends Constantine a purple robe, 88.
consulship with Constantine, 92.
letters to cities of Britain, 148.
sends Placidia to Constantinople, 322.

Idatius, the Spaniard, his chronicle, 8.
and Prosper, comparison of their story of Aetius, 352.
Ingenuus, house of, scene of Placidia's wedding, 199.

Jagello, of Lithuania, 292.
Jerome, letter to Ageruchia, 21.
hears of Atawulf from soldier of Narbonne, 177.

John, leaves Exsuperantius unavenged, 273.
chosen peaceably at Ravenna, 273, 322.
executed at Aquileia, 274, 324.
John Tzimiskês, first emperor of that name, 324.
Jovinus, assumes purple at Mainz, 172.
acknowledged by Atawulf, 180.
taken captive at Narbonne, 187.
slain by Dardanus, 188.
Jovius, takes to Ravenna the message of Constantine, 88.
promises aid of Constantine, 89.
allowed to return to Arles, 89.
Julian, son of Constantine, 56.
sent prisoner to Ravenna, 121.
beheaded by order of Honorius, 122.
the Nobilissimus, 122.
head set up at Carthage, 127.
Julius Nepos, gives way to Odowaker, 257–8.
Justin, general of Constantine, 49.
Justinian, falls in battle, 63.
officer of Constantine, 371.
Justus, a general of Constans, 96.

Kyriakos, attempts the life of Aetius, 320.

Lagodius, kinsman of Honorius, 70.
flees to Constantinople, 78.
Laurels, the Two, scene of the murder of Aetius, 368.
Legions in Britain choose an Emperor, 44.
Limenius, represents Honorius in Gaul, 50.
flight of, 50.
slaughter of, 60.
Loire, no Frenchman south of, 253.

Mainz, Moguntiacum, stormed, 30.
Malmesbury, William of, his use of word tyrant, 82.
Marcus, chosen Tyrant by legions in Britain, 44.
date of his election, 45.
slain, 46.
Margaret, the English, reforms the Scotch Malcolm, 295.
Marseilles, Massalia, Massilia, bound up with fate of Constantine, 54.
Atawulf repulsed at, 197.
saved by Count Boniface, 197.
besieged by Atawulf, 314.
Mavortius, besieges Boniface, 332.
Maximin, chosen by Gerontius as Tyrant, 99.
who was he? 100.
holds court at Tarragona, 101.
ceases to reign, 128.
flees to barbarian friends, 128.
Montmajour, the hill of, 280.
Mussulman, parted from Christian by his nearness, 293.

Nadders, hill of, 280.
Narbonne, suggested headquarters of Constans, 106.

Narbonne, entered by Gothic army, 186.
disruption of, 187.
in hands of the West-Goths, 240.
Nebiogast, or Neobigast, a general of Constantine, 49.
in command of Roman legions leaving Britain, 49.
deals with Sarus, 63.
is murdered, 63.
companion of Justinian, 371.
Nounechia, wife of Gerontius, put to death by Gerontius, 125.
Novempopulania, land of, the fairest in Gaul, 241.

Olympiodôros' History, 7.
Olympius, intrigues against Stilicho, 60.
Optila, slayer of Aetius, 369.
Orosius' History, 11, 20, 22, 25.
hears the story told to Jerome at Bethlehem, 177.

Patria, new meaning of, 25.
Patroclus, bishop of Arles, 282.
killed at the bidding of Felix, 283.
Paulinus of Pella, 201, 244.
lives at Bourdeaux, 204.
count of the largesse to Attalus, 205.
flees to Bazas, 209.
appeals to Goar, 211.
in exile in Marseilles, 244.
his land coveted by Goths, 244.
Pelagia, wife of Boniface, his last advice to her, 350.
Penmachur, inscription, 371.
Petronius Maximus, his complicity in the death of Aetius, 367.
Placidia, the aspirants for her hand, 177.
bears a son to Atawulf at Barcelona, 215.
insulted by Sigeric, 221.
sent honourably to Honorius, 222.
Honoria, daughter of, 223.
Poictiers, in kingdom of Arian Goth, 237.
Pollentia, fight of, 13, 17.
victory won by Romans through denudation of frontiers, 18.
Possidius, besieged at Hippo, 338.
Procopius, his strange story of Anglian migration, 161.
story of Britons fleeing to Gaul, 164.
his account of John, 322.
his account of entry of Vandals into Africa, 334.
Prosper of Aquitaine, his chronicle, 8, 22.
his account of entry of Vandals into Africa, 334.
and Idatius, comparison of their story of Aetius, 352.
Prosper Tiro, his mention of affairs in Britain, 9.

Radagaisus, ally of Alaric, 13.
the hosts of, 29.
Renatus Frigeridus, quoted by Gregory of Tours, 7.
Respendial, the Alan King, helps the Vandals, 28.
Respublica Romana, meaning of, 306.
Rhætia, defenders of, 18.
Rhenish frontier, power of Rome on, 14.

Rhodez, in kingdom of the West-Goth, 239.
Riotimus, British king in Gaul, 166, 372.
helps Emperor Anthemius, 373.
Roman Gaul, its view of heathen Chlodowig, 290.
Roman power in Britain, end of, 48.
Romania, good luck of, 102.
Romans, of Aquitaine, their evil character, 242.
give hostages to Goth, 284.
Rugila, death of, 352.
Rusticus, Decimius, Master of the Offices, 96.
flees to Constantinople, 103.
slain, 189.
Rutilius Namatianus, enemy of Stilicho, 26.

Saintes, in hands of West-Goths, 238.
Sallustius, brother of Jovinus, slain, 189.
Salona, sea of Long, 279.
Salvian, his writings offer help in history of period, 9.
on the four sacks of Rome, 195.
on richness of land of Aquitaine, 241.
Sarus, sent to Gaul by Stilicho, 61.
gains victory over Justinian, 61.
escapes to Italy, 64.
marches against Constantine, 110.
the Goth, his deadly feud with Atawulf, 182.
renounces Honorius and joins Jovinus, 183.
killed by soldiers of Atawulf, 183.
Saxon settlements in Britain and Gaul contrasted, 43.
Saxony, in Gaul, 5.
in Britain, 5.
Saxons, possible invasion of Gaul by, 33.
Scipio, consul, 306.
Sebastian, associated in imperial dignity by Jovinus, 184.
head sent to Honorius, 186.
goes from Spain to Africa, 350.
son-in-law of Boniface, 351.
flees to Constantinople, 351.
Seville, passes permanently from Roman power, 236.
Sidonius, his account of Saxon sea-rovers, 40.
epitaph on his grandfather Apollinaris, 76.
Sigeberht, king, wounded at Zülpich, 296.
Sigeric, brother of Sarus, hailed king by West-Goths, 221.
slaughters children of Atawulf, 222.
murdered, 222.
Sigesar, bishop, deprived of Atawulf's children, 222.
Sigisvult, the Goth, 323.
carries on war against Boniface, 333.
Silingi, settle in Bætica, 141.
Sinox, plots against Mavortius, 333.
plots against Boniface, 333.
put to death by Boniface, 333.
Sira, said in legend to have converted Chosroes, 295.
Spain, untouched by strangers since days of Gallienus, 66.
Spain, small part affected by claims of Honorius, 133.

Spain, settlements of the nations in, 232.
Spanish legions demand withdrawal of Honorians, 95.
Stilicho, restores Roman power on banks of Rhine, 14.
cuts off the followers of Radagaisus, 22.
invaders of Gaul invited by, 25.
Rutilius' verses on, 26.
Gregory of Tours' mistake concerning, 27.
Illyrian campaign, 58.
sends Sarus to Gaul, 61.
slain by Heraclian, 184.
consul, 306.
seeks empire for his son Eucherius, 365.
Suevians, their kingdom in Spain, 20.
take part in invasion of Gaul, 20.
settle in Galicia, 141.
Sulpicius Alexander, quoted by Gregory of Tours, 7.
Syagrius, called king by Gregory of Tours, 259.

Tarragona, Maximus reigns at, 103.
Terouanne, home of Morini, 31.
Theodolind, the Catholic, wins the Arian Agilulf, 295.
Theodoric, succeeds Wallia, 269.
form of name, 269, note.
grandson of Alaric, 269.
flight from Arles, 281.
congratulates Chlodowig, 300.
urges clemency, 300.
his policy, 302.
his restraint of Chlodowig, 303.
Theodoric, contrasted with Chlodowig, 303.
Theodosian family, their rustic army in Spain, 72.
routed, 77.
Theodosiolus, a kinsman of Honorius, 70.
flees to Honorius, 78.
Theodosius, son of Atawulf, dies at Barcelona, 219.
the infant, his grave Atawulf's sole possession in Spain, 263.
takes steps to overthrow John, 274.
a hostage given to Theodoric, 286.
Thorismund, slain by Theodoric and Frederic, 363.
Ticinum, harangue of Honorius to soldiers at, 60.
meeting at, 61.
Tostig and Harold, contrasted with Boniface and Aetius, 312.
Toulouse, spared through Bishop Exsuperius, 31.
future home of Gothic kings, 197.
in hands of the West-Goths, 240.
Tournay, captured in Teutonic invasion, 31.
Transtila, slayer of Aetius, 369.
Trier, sacked by Vandals, 29.
held by Constantine, 53.
coins of Constantine struck there, 53.
sacked by Franks, 195.
Trigetius, embassy of, 363.
Tyrant, general meaning of word, 82–4.

Valence, Valentia, one of the great fortresses of the land, 62.

Valence, Constantine takes shelter there, 62.
siege of, by Sarus, 63.
Sarus raises siege of, 64.
Valentinian and Placidia sent by Theodosius to dislodge John, 324.
slays Aetius, 365.
Vandals, their kingdom in Spain, 20.
take part in invasion of Gaul, 20.
of Bætica, a power in Spain, 235.
besiege Boniface in Hippo, 336.
Vedast, St., an agent in conversion of the Franks, 297.
Verenianus, kinsman of Honorius in Spain, 70.
rises to resist Constantine in Spain, 70.
captured by Constans, 77.
put to death by Constantine, 78.
Vesonna, in hands of West-Goths, 238–9.
Vetto, his mission to Spain, 277.
Vienne, Constans' headquarters, 105.
pagan temple at, 107.
basilica of Avitus at, 107.
captured by Gerontius, 108.
Vouziers, site of the miracle worked by St. Vedast, 298.

Wallia, hailed as king, 222.
estimate of his character, 226.
successor to Atawulf, 227.
faithful friend of the Empire, 228.
proposed to found an empire in Africa, 228.
his fleet shattered, 229.
listens to Roman envoy Euplutius, 229.
wages war in Spain in name of Rome, 234.
Jordanis' confused account of his reign, 249.
grandfather of Ricimer, 250.
Wladislaf, wins Polish crown, 292.
Worms, Vaugiones, besieged and captured, 31.
Wulfilas, goes with Constantius against Constantine, 113.
his ambush at Arles, 119.

Zaragoza, Cæsar Augusta, Constans places his court there, 78.
Zôzimos, History, 22.
Zôzomen, History, 26.
Zülpich, battle of, 296.

THE END.

WORKS BY

EDWARD A. FREEMAN

M.A., D.C.L., LL.D.

8vo. 10s. 6d.

HISTORICAL ESSAYS. First Series.

CONTENTS: The Mythical and Romantic Elements in Early English History—The Continuity of English History—The Relations between the Crowns of England and Scotland—Saint Thomas of Canterbury and his Biographers—The Reign of Edward the Third—The Holy Roman Empire—The Franks and the Gauls—The Early Sieges of Paris—Frederick the First, King of Italy—The Emperor Frederick the Second—Charles the Bold—Presidential Government.

8vo. 12s.

HISTORICAL ESSAYS. Third Series.

CONTENTS: First Impressions of Rome—The Illyrian Emperors and their Land—Augusta Treverorum—The Goths at Ravenna—Race and Language—The Byzantine Empire—First Impressions of Athens—Mediaeval and Modern Greece—The Southern Slaves—Sicilian Cycles—The Normans at Palermo.

8vo. 12s. 6d.

HISTORICAL ESSAYS. Fourth Series.

CONTENTS: Carthage—French and English Towns—Aquae Sextiae—History of Orange—Augustodunum—Périgueux and Cahors—The Lords of Ardres—Points in the History of Portugal and Brazil—Alter Orbis—Historical Cycles—Augustan Ages—English Civil Wars—The Battle of Wakefield—National Prosperity and the Reformation—Cardinal Pole—Archbishop Parker—Decayed Boroughs—The Case of the Deanery of Exeter—The Growth of Commonwealths—The Constitution of the German Empire—Nobility—The House of Lords—Index.

8vo. 14s.

ENGLISH TOWNS AND DISTRICTS. A series of addresses and sketches. With illustrations and map.

8vo. 8s. 6d.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS. Six Lectures read before the Royal Institution in January and February, 1873. With the Unity of History. The Rede Lecture read before the University of Cambridge, May 29, 1872.

Extra Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

HISTORY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN GREECE AND ITALY. A new edition, edited by J. B. BURY, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge.

WORKS BY EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D.

8vo. 10s. net.

WESTERN EUROPE IN THE FIFTH CENTURY.

8vo. 10s. net.

WESTERN EUROPE IN THE EIGHTH CENTURY AND ONWARD.

Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

SKETCHES FROM THE SUBJECT AND NEIGHBOUR LANDS OF VENICE.

Globe 8vo. 6s.

OLD ENGLISH HISTORY FOR CHILDREN.

Crown 8vo. 5s.

GROWTH OF THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES.

Pott 8vo. 3s. 6d.

GENERAL SKETCH OF EUROPEAN HISTORY. [Historical Course for Schools.]

Pott 8vo. 1s.

THE HISTORY OF EUROPE. With maps. [History Primers.]

Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

SKETCHES OF TRAVEL IN NORMANDY AND MAINE.

Globe 8vo. 3s. 6d.

HISTORY OF THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF WELLS. As Illustrating the History of the Cathedral Churches of the Old Foundation.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

GREATER GREECE AND GREATER BRITAIN, AND GEORGE WASHINGTON THE EXPANDER OF ENGLAND. Two Lectures with an appendix.

Crown 8vo. 2s.

THE OFFICE OF THE HISTORICAL PROFESSOR. An Inaugural Lecture read in the Museum of Oxford, October, 1884.

Crown 8vo. 1s.

DISESTABLISHMENT AND DISENDOWMENT, WHAT ARE THEY? Reprinted, with Additions, from the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF WILLIAM I. [Twelve English Statesmen Series.]

Two vols. Extra Crown 8vo. 17s. net.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF EDWARD A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D. By Dean Stephens.

LONDON: MACMILLAN & Co., Ltd.

678

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
00014334981